

mittee to Investigate Un-American Activities and the appropriation of additional funds to foster and continue this committee; to the Special Committee on Un-American Activities.

66. By Mr. PFEIFER: Petition of conference of mayors and other municipal officials of the State of New York, Albany, N. Y., concerning Federal taxation of municipal securities and revenues; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

67. By Mr. SABATH: Petition of the Cook County Council, the American Legion, Department of Illinois, petitioning consideration of their resolution which will give to veterans, their widows, and the wives of disabled veterans a priority in assignment and retention on all work-relief projects in the Works Progress Administration; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

68. By Mr. SHORT: Petition of certain citizens of Neosho, Mo., asking Congress to pass legislation to prevent the advertising of alcoholic beverages by press and radio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

69. Also, petition of the Mountain Grove, Mo., local union of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union, asking Congress to pass legislation to prevent the advertising of alcoholic beverages by press and radio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

70. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the General Welfare Federation of America, Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their petition from California, Eighteenth Congressional District, with reference to the General Welfare Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

71. Also, petition of the Wisconsin Chiefs of Police Association, Kaukauna, Wis., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to preventing the retroactive application of any Federal tax upon the employees of the States and their instrumentalities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

72. Also, petition of Pablo Ozeguera, Habana, Cuba, petitioning consideration of his petition, which seems to indicate the general tenor that national as well as international relations demand that we, as men of good will, strive for peace, stability, and for the economic progress of men and nations; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

73. Also, petition of Ireanus J. Leitemeyer Post, No. 1982, Veterans of Foreign Wars, New Iberia, La., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to foreign sugar and domestic sugar industry; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

74. Also, petition of the National Sojourners, Inc., Columbus Chapter, No. 10, Columbus, Ohio, petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to the Dies committee; to the Committee on Rules.

75. Also, petition of the General Welfare Federation of America, Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution from the State of Florida, First Congressional District, with reference to General Welfare Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

76. Also, petition of the General Welfare Federation of America, Washington, D. C., petitioning consideration of their resolution from the State of Missouri, Fifth Congressional District, with reference to the General Welfare Act; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

## SENATE

TUESDAY, JANUARY 10, 1939

The Chaplain, Rev. Z. Barney T. Phillips, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou who art greater than our greatest thought of Thee, whose greatness is unsearchable, waken in us by Thy secret indwelling all slumbering possibilities of our own greatness, that we may show forth the gift of God within us, even though as yet it may be but our unaccepted, unclaimed inheritance. Keep us calm each day in the strength of ever greater things achieved and, as we sit at the feet of the

LXXXIV—11

Master on the heights to which He rose, help us to attain that further greater good which, foreshadowed in dreams and sown in the soil of holy aspiration, shall one day manifest itself as the fruit of Thy purpose for Thy children. We ask it in the name of Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

### THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. BARKLEY, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of the calendar day Monday, January 9, 1939, was dispensed with, and the Journal was approved.

### CALL OF THE ROLL

Mr. MINTON. I suggest the absence of a quorum.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will call the roll.

The Chief Clerk called the roll, and the following Senators answered to their names:

Adams	Danaher	Johnson, Calif.	Pittman
Andrews	Davis	Johnson, Colo.	Radcliffe
Ashurst	Donahay	King	Reed
Austin	Downey	Lee	Reynolds
Bailey	Ellender	Lewis	Russell
Bankhead	Frazier	Lodge	Schwartz
Barbour	George	Logan	Schwellenbach
Barkley	Gerry	Lucas	Sheppard
Bilbo	Gibson	Lundeen	Shipstead
Bone	Gillette	McCarran	Smathers
Borah	Glass	McKellar	Smith
Bridges	Green	McNary	Taft
Brown	Guffey	Maloney	Thomas, Okla.
Bulow	Gurney	Mead	Thomas, Utah
Burke	Hale	Miller	Tobey
Byrd	Harrison	Minton	Truman
Byrnes	Hatch	Murray	Trydings
Capper	Hayden	Neely	Vandenberg
Caraway	Herring	Norris	Van Nuys
Chavez	Hill	Nye	Wagner
Clark, Idaho	Holman	O'Mahoney	Walsh
Clark, Mo.	Holt	Overton	White
Connally	Hughes	Pepper	Wiley

Mr. MINTON. I announce that the Senator from Illinois [Mr. LEWIS] and the Senator from Montana [Mr. WHEELER] are detained on important public business.

Mr. AUSTIN. I announce that the Senator from Delaware [Mr. TOWNSEND] is necessarily absent.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Ninety-two Senators have answered to their names. A quorum is present.

### SPECIAL COMMITTEE ON TAXATION OF GOVERNMENTAL SECURITIES AND SALARIES

The VICE PRESIDENT. The Chair announces the appointment of the Senator from Arkansas [Mr. MILLER] as a member of the Special Committee on Taxation of Governmental Securities and Salaries under Senate Resolution 303, agreed to June 16, 1938, vice Hon. George McGill, former Senator from Kansas.

### REFERENCE OF NOMINATIONS AND TREATIES

Mr. BARKLEY. I submit a resolution and ask unanimous consent for its present consideration.

There being no objection, the resolution was read, considered, and agreed to, as follows:

*Resolved*, That on calendar days of the present session of the Congress when no executive session is held, nominations or treaties received from the President of the United States may, where no objection is interposed, be referred, as in executive session, to the appropriate committees by the Presiding Officer of the Senate.

### STANDING COMMITTEES OF THE SENATE

Mr. BARKLEY. By direction of the steering committee of the majority, I send forward a list of assignments of Senators to the various committees, and ask that it be read and approved by the Senate.

Mr. NYE. Mr. President, in conjunction with the list submitted by the Senator from Kentucky at the request of the minority leader, I submit the report of the committee on committees of the minority, which I understand is to be offered with the presentation of the majority leader.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The clerk will read the lists of committee assignments on behalf of the majority and the minority, and, without objection, they will be considered together.

The Chief Clerk read the majority and minority assignments, which, in the form of an order, were agreed to, as follows:

*Ordered*, That the following shall constitute the standing committees of the Senate of the Seventy-sixth Congress:

On Agriculture and Forestry: Messrs. Smith (chairman), Wheeler, Thomas of Oklahoma, Bankhead, Bulow, Mrs. Caraway, Messrs. Hatch, Bilbo, Schwellenbach, Gillette, Ellender, Minton, Lucas, —, Norris, McNary, Capper, Frazier, Shipstead, and Wiley.

On Appropriations: Messrs. Glass (chairman), McKellar, Hayden, Thomas of Oklahoma, Byrnes, Tydings, Russell, Adams, McCarran, Overton, Bankhead, O'Mahoney, Truman, Burke, Green, Maloney, Chavez, Hale, Nye, Townsend, Bridges, Lodge, Holman, and Taft.

To Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate: Messrs. Byrnes (chairman), Tydings, Truman, and Townsend.

On Banking and Currency: Messrs. Wagner (chairman), Glass, Barkley, Byrnes, Bankhead, Adams, Maloney, Radcliffe, Brown, Hughes, Herring, Smathers, Miller, Clark of Idaho, Downey, Townsend, Frazier, Tobey, Danaher, and Taft.

On Civil Service: Messrs. Bulow (chairman), McKellar, George, Logan, Neely, Byrd, Downey, White, Gibson, and Frazier.

On Claims: Messrs. Logan (chairman), Bailey, Burke, Schwellenbach, Brown, Ellender, Hughes, Schwartz, Smathers, Capper, Townsend, Tobey, and Wiley.

On Commerce: Messrs. Bailey (chairman), Sheppard, Mrs. Caraway, Messrs. Clark of Missouri, Overton, Bilbo, Donahey, Guffey, Maloney, Radcliffe, Pepper, Lee, Hill, Mead, McNary, Johnson of California, Vandenberg, White, Gibson, and Barbour.

On the District of Columbia: Messrs. King (chairman), Glass, Tydings, Lewis, Bankhead, McCarran, Reynolds, Bilbo, Overton, Hughes, Clark of Idaho, Capper, Austin, Bridges, and Holman.

On Education and Labor: Messrs. Thomas of Utah (chairman), Walsh, Murray, Donahey, Holt, Pepper, Ellender, Lee, Hill, Borah, La Follette, Davis, and Taft.

On Enrolled Bills: Mrs. Caraway (chairman), Messrs. Truman and Reed.

On Expenditures in the Executive Departments: Messrs. Lewis (chairman), Wagner, Van Nuys, Pittman, Barkley, Davis, and Lodge.

On Finance: Messrs. Harrison (chairman), King, George, Walsh, Barkley, Connally, Bailey, Clark of Missouri, Byrd, Gerry, Guffey, Brown, Herring, Johnson of Colorado, Radcliffe, La Follette, Capper, Vandenberg, Townsend, Davis, and Lodge.

On Foreign Relations: Messrs. Pittman (chairman), Harrison, George, Wagner, Connally, Lewis, Thomas of Utah, Van Nuys, Murray, Schwellenbach, Pepper, Green, Barkley, Reynolds, Guffey, Gillette, Borah, Johnson of California, Capper, La Follette, Vandenberg, White, and Shipstead.

On Immigration: Messrs. Russell (chairman), King, Maloney, Schwellenbach, Holt, Andrews, Hughes, Smathers, Herring, —, Johnson of California, Austin, Capper, and Holman.

On Indian Affairs: Messrs. Thomas of Oklahoma (chairman), Wheeler, Ashurst, Bulow, Hatch, O'Mahoney, Donahey, Chavez, Johnson of Colorado, Lundeen, Frazier, La Follette, Shipstead, and McNary.

On Interoceanic Canals: Messrs. Clark of Missouri (chairman), Hayden, Pepper, Ellender, Downey, —, Bridges, and Lodge.

On Interstate Commerce: Messrs. Wheeler (chairman), Smith, Wagner, Barkley, Neely, Bone, Donahey, Minton, Truman, Andrews, Johnson of Colorado, Schwartz, Hill, Lundeen, —, White, Austin, Shipstead, Tobey, Reed, and Gurney.

On Irrigation and Reclamation: Messrs. Bankhead (chairman), Sheppard, Pittman, Ashurst, Adams, McCarran, Overton, Hatch, O'Mahoney, Chavez, Lee, Clark of Idaho, McNary, Johnson of California, Townsend, Nye, and Gurney.

On the Judiciary: Messrs. Ashurst (chairman), King, Neely, McCarran, Van Nuys, Logan, Hatch, Burke, Pittman, Connally, O'Mahoney, Hughes, Miller, Borah, Norris, Austin, Danaher, and Wiley.

On the Library: Messrs. Barkley (chairman), McKellar, Thomas of Oklahoma, Mrs. Caraway, Messrs. Bilbo, Radcliffe, Herring, Gibson, McNary, and Tobey.

On Manufactures: Messrs. Overton (chairman), Smith, Sheppard, Russell, Gerry, Guffey, Brown, Johnson of Colorado, Mead, La Follette, Barbour, Reed, and Danaher.

On Military Affairs: Messrs. Sheppard (chairman), Lewis, Logan, Reynolds, Thomas of Utah, Minton, Johnson of Colorado, Lee, Schwartz, Lundeen, Hill, Clark of Missouri, Downey, Austin, Nye, Bridges, Gurney, and Holman.

On Mines and Mining: Messrs. Guffey (chairman), Pittman, Hayden, Logan, Bulow, Thomas of Utah, Holt, Johnson of Colorado, Schwartz, Davis, Reed, Taft, and Wiley.

On Naval Affairs: Messrs. Walsh (chairman), Tydings, Smith, Russell, Bone, Byrd, Gerry, Holt, Andrews, Gillette, Ellender, Lucas, Hale, Davis, Johnson of California, Gibson, and Barbour.

On Patents: Messrs. Bone (chairman), Smith, Pepper, Clark of Idaho, Lucas, Norris, and White.

On Pensions: Messrs. Minton (chairman), Wheeler, Walsh, Thomas of Utah, Schwartz, Bilbo, Schwellenbach, Hill, Frazier, Townsend, and Shipstead.

On Post Offices and Post Roads: Messrs. McKellar (chairman), Hayden, Bailey, Bulow, Byrnes, Logan, O'Mahoney, Murray, Chavez, Holt, Ellender, Smathers, Mead, Clark of Idaho, Frazier, La Follette, Bridges, Davis, and Reed.

On Printing: Messrs. Hayden (chairman), Walsh, Truman, Pepper, Lundeen, Miller, Danaher, and Gurney.

On Privileges and Elections: Messrs. George (chairman), King, Smith, Connally, Logan, Hatch, Minton, Green, Burke, Mead, Lucas, —, Austin, Johnson of California, Nye, Bridges, and Wiley.

On Public Buildings and Grounds: Messrs. Connally (chairman), Ashurst, Tydings, Walsh, Maloney, Truman, Chavez, Andrews, Gillette, Green, Herring, Hale, Barbour, and Taft.

On Public Lands and Surveys: Messrs. Adams (chairman), Pittman, Ashurst, Wagner, Hatch, O'Mahoney, Murray, McCarran, Andrews, Lee, Smathers, Nye, Borah, Gurney, and Holman.

On Rules: Messrs. Neely (chairman), Harrison, McKellar, Adams, Byrd, Lewis, Gillette, Miller, Andrews, Hale, Vandenberg, Barbour, and Tobey.

On Territories and Insular Affairs: Messrs. Tydings (chairman), Pittman, Hayden, King, Clark of Missouri, Reynolds, Bone, McKellar, Wheeler, Gerry, Lundeen, Miller, Nye, Vandenberg, Gibson, Lodge, and Danaher.

Mr. BARKLEY. Mr. President, the list of committees read completes the committee membership except for the Senator-elect from Tennessee [Mr. STEWART], who has not yet been sworn in. He has been assigned to his committees, to take effect when he arrives. When that is done the committees will be complete.

#### MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Hess, one of his secretaries.

#### REPORT OF CENTRAL STATISTICAL BOARD

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read and referred to the Committee on Finance, as follows:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, a report of the Central Statistical Board on the Returns Made by the Public to the Federal Government. I recommend that this report be printed as a public document.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 10, 1939.

[Note: Report accompanied similar message to the House of Representatives.]

#### REPORT OF BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF PANAMA RAILROAD CO.

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying report, referred to the Committee on Interoceanic Canals, as follows:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the Eighty-ninth Annual Report of the Board of Directors of the Panama Railroad Co. for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1938.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 10, 1939.

#### MELVIN GERARD ALVEY

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the Acting Secretary of the Treasury transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Melvin Gerard Alvey, boatswain's mate, first class, lifesaving, United States Coast Guard, which, with the accompanying papers, was referred to the Committee on Claims.

#### EMPLOYMENT OF ALIENS BY GOVERNMENTAL DEPARTMENTS AND AGENCIES

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate a letter from the secretary of the Reconstruction Finance Corporation, submitting, in response to Senate Resolution 285, agreed to June 8, 1938, a report pertaining to aliens employed by the Corporation and the reasons for such employment, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.

He also laid before the Senate a letter from the Administrator of the United States Housing Authority, stating, in response to Senate Resolution 285, agreed to June 8, 1938, that no aliens are employed by that Authority, which was referred to the Committee on Education and Labor.



## PETITIONS

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate petitions of sundry citizens of Milwaukee, Wis., praying for adherence by the United States to the principle of neutrality as contained in existing law and the modification of the original neutrality law so as to include civil as well as international conflicts, which were referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

Mr. LODGE presented petitions of sundry citizens of Leominster, Mass., praying for the enactment of the so-called Townsend General Welfare Act, which were referred to the Committee on Finance.

## REFUGE FOR PERSECUTED CHILDREN OF GERMANY

Mr. WAGNER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD and appropriately referred a petition submitted to the President yesterday, urging the American people to join in offering refuge to German children subject to religious and racial persecution in their native land.

The petition is signed by His Eminence George Cardinal Mundelein, Archbishop of Chicago, and 47 other outstanding prelates representing the Catholic and the various Protestant faiths.

There being no objection, the petition was referred to the Committee on Foreign Relations and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The American people has made clear its reaction to the oppression of all minority groups, religious and racial, throughout Germany. It has been especially moved by the plight of the children. Every heart has been touched, and the Nation has spoken out its sorrow and dismay through the voices of its statesmen, teachers, and religious leaders. Americans have felt that protest, however vigorous, and sympathy, however deep, are not enough, and that these must translate themselves into such action as shall justify faith.

We have been stirred by the knowledge that Holland and England have opened their doors and homes to many of these children. We conceive it to be our duty, in the name of the American tradition and the religious spirit common to our Nation to urge the people, by its Congress and Executive, to express sympathy through special treatment of the young, robbed of country, homes, and parents. A heartening token of the mood of America is to be found in the fact that thousands of Americans of all faiths have made known their eagerness to take these young children into their homes, without burden or obligation to the State.

Working within and under the laws of Congress, through special enactment, if necessary, the Nation can offer sanctuary to a part of these children by united expression of its will to help.

To us it seems that the duty of Americans in dealing with the youthful victims of a regime which punishes innocent and tender children as if they were offenders, is to remember the monition of Him who said, "Suffer little children to come unto me." And in that spirit we call on all Americans to join together without regard to race, religion, or creed in offering refuge to children as a token of our sympathy and as a symbol of our faith in the ideals of human brotherhood.

[The above statement by a group of representatives of Christian churches of America is endorsed by the following:]

Dr. Martin Anderson, Central Presbyterian Church, Denver, Colo.; Dr. Albert William Beaven, president of Colgate Rochester Divinity School, Rochester, N. Y.; Dr. Oscar F. Blackwelder, Lutheran Church of the Reformation, Washington, D. C.; Dr. Walter Russell Bowie, Grace Church, New York City; Dr. Samuel Cavert, executive secretary, Federal Council of Churches of Christ in America, New York City; Dr. Allen Knight Chalmers, Broadway Tabernacle, 211 West Fifty-sixth Street, New York City; Dr. Henry Sloane Coffin, Union Theological Seminary, New York City; Dr. Henry Crane, Central Methodist Church, Detroit, Mich.; Bishop Ralph Cushman, Methodist Church, Denver, Colo.; Dr. Harry Emerson Fosdick, Riverside Church, New York City; Rev. Graham Frank, First Christian Church, Dallas, Tex.; Rt. Rev. James Edward Freeman, Bishop of Washington, Washington, D. C.; Dr. Robert Freeman, Presbyterian Church, Pasadena, Calif.; Dr. Louis Hartman, editor, Zion's Herald, Boston, Mass.; Dr. Ivan Lee Holt, St. Louis, Mo.; Rt. Rev. Edwin H. Hughes, Bishop of Washington area, Methodist Episcopal Church, Washington, D. C.; Dr. Robert Scott Inglis, pastor emeritus of Third Presbyterian Church, Newark, N. J.; Dr. Edgar DeWitt Jones, Central Woodward Church, Detroit, Mich.; Dr. Meredith Ashby Jones, Atlanta, Ga.; Rev. McIllyar H. Lichliter, First Congregational Church, Columbus, Ohio; Dr. Mark Allison Matthews, First Presbyterian Church, Seattle, Wash.; Most Rev. Charles Hubert Le Blond, Bishop of St. Joseph, St. Joseph, Mo.; Rev. Oscar E. Maurer, moderator, National Council of Congregational-Christian Churches, New Haven, Conn.; Bishop Charles Mead,

Methodist Episcopal Church, Kansas City, Mo.; Dr. Julius Valdemar Moldenhawer, First Presbyterian Church, New York City; His Eminence George Cardinal Mundelein, Archbishop of Chicago, Chicago, Ill.; Rev. Roger T. Noe, president, International Convention of Disciples of Christ, Nashville, Tenn.; Rt. Rev. John O'Grady, secretary, National Conference of Catholic Charities; Very Rev. Arthur A. O'Leary, S. J., president, Georgetown University, Washington, D. C.; Rev. Joseph D. Ostermann, executive director, Committee for the Catholic Refugees from Germany; Bishop G. Bromley Oxnam, Methodist Church, Omaha, Nebr.; Dr. Albert Wentworth Palmer, president, Chicago Theological Seminary, Chicago, Ill.; Rev. Daniel Alfred Poling, editor, Christian Herald and Christian Endeavor World, Baptist Temple, Philadelphia, Pa.; Dr. George W. Richards, president, Theological Seminary of the Reformed Church, Lancaster, Pa.; Most Rev. Joseph Francis Rummel, S. T. D., Archbishop of New Orleans, New Orleans, La.; Most Rev. James H. Ryan, S. T. D., Bishop of Omaha, Omaha, Nebr.; Rt. Rev. John Augustine Ryan, director, Social Action Department, National Catholic Welfare Conference, Washington, D. C.; Rt. Rev. William Scarlett, Bishop of Missouri Protestant Episcopal Church, St. Louis, Mo.; Dr. Avery A. Shaw, president, Denison University, Granville, Ohio; Rev. Maurice S. Sheehy, head, Department of Religious Education, Catholic University of America; Most Rev. Bernard James Sheil, Auxiliary Bishop of Chicago, Ill.; Dr. Joseph Richard Sizoo, St. Nicholas Church, New York City; Dr. Ralph W. Sockman, Christ's Methodist Episcopal Church, New York City; Dr. Robert Elliott Speer, president of the board of trustees, Princeton Seminary; Dr. Anson Phelps Stokes, canon of Washington Cathedral, Washington, D. C.; Dr. John Timothy Stone, president, Presbyterian Theological Seminary, Chicago, Ill.; Dr. Howard Thurman, dean of chapel, Howard University, Washington, D. C.; Dr. Ezra Allen Van Nuys, Calvary Presbyterian Church, San Francisco, Calif.; Dr. John Anderson Vance, First Presbyterian Church, Detroit, Mich.

## EXECUTIVE REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

As in executive session,

Mr. HARRISON, from the Committee on Finance, reported favorably the nomination of Ellen S. Woodward, of Mississippi, to be a member of the Social Security Board for the remainder of the term expiring August 13, 1943, to which office she was appointed during the last recess of the Senate, vice Mary W. Dewson, resigned.

He also, from the same committee, reported favorably the nominations of sundry officers in the United States Public Health Service.

Mr. BAILEY, from the Committee on Finance, reported favorably the nomination of John W. Hanes, of North Carolina, to be Under Secretary of the Treasury, in place of Roswell Magill, resigned.

Mr. WALSH, from the Committee on Finance, reported favorably the nomination of Preston Delano, of Massachusetts, to be Comptroller of the Currency, in place of J. F. T. O'Connor, resigned.

He also, from the Committee on Naval Affairs, reported favorably the nominations of sundry officers for promotion in the Navy.

The VICE PRESIDENT. Without objection, the reports will be received and placed on the Executive Calendar.

## BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. BARKLEY:

S. 477. A bill to provide for the regulation of the sale of certain securities in interstate and foreign commerce and through the mails, and the regulation of the trust indentures under which the same are issued, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. HATCH:

S. 478. A bill to provide for more expeditious payment of amounts due to farmers under agricultural programs; and

S. 479. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, with respect to marketing quotas for wheat; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

By Mr. MALONEY:

S. 480. A bill to provide for a census of unemployment, to prohibit the interstate transportation of certain articles and commodities produced under conditions which are inimical

to the public interest, to protect the health and provide for the welfare of the unemployed, to provide for the general economic welfare of the Nation, and for other purposes; and

S. 481 (by request). A bill to provide for a continuous census of unemployment, to stabilize employment, to provide for the establishment of fair labor standards in employments in and affecting interstate commerce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

S. 482. A bill to prevent the retroactive application of any Federal tax upon the employees of the States and their instrumentalities; to the Committee on Finance.

S. 483. A bill granting a pension to Sadie L. Doran; and

S. 484. A bill granting a pension to Alfarata Phillips; to the Committee on Pensions.

S. 485. A bill providing for the cancelation of certain charges under section 20 of the River and Harbor Act of March 3, 1899; to the Committee on Commerce.

By Mr. MEAD:

S. 486. A bill to further increase the efficiency and safety of air-mail transportation, and for other purposes;

S. 487. A bill to establish a system of longevity pay for postal employees;

S. 488. A bill to provide for the appointment and promotion of substitute postal employees, and for other purposes;

S. 489. A bill to increase the salaries of letter carriers in the village delivery service; and

S. 490. A bill to adjust the basis of compensation for overtime services of certain employees in the Postal Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads.

By Mr. McNARY:

S. 491. A bill to amend section 17 of the Federal Highway Act; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

S. 492. A bill for the relief of Theodor Knudson; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 493. A bill to place the names of Jonathan H. Pigman and Jeannette Earle Morser on the final roll of the Cherokee Indian Tribe of Oklahoma, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. CAPPER:

S. 494. A bill to name the bridge to be erected over the Anacostia River in the District of Columbia after the late "March King," John Philip Sousa, composer of the Stars and Stripes Forever; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

S. 495. A bill to amend the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and the act of June 12, 1934, relating to reciprocal-trade agreements; to the Committee on Finance.

By Mr. KING:

S. 496. A bill for the relief of Chris Barkas and Mabel Barkas; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 497. A bill providing for the incorporation of certain persons as Group Hospitalization, Inc.; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. THOMAS of Oklahoma:

S. 498. A bill authorizing an appropriation to carry out the provisions of section 26 of the agreement with the Muskogee or Creek Tribe of Indians, approved March 1, 1901; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. ASHURST:

S. 499 (by request). A bill to amend an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1910, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1909, as amended, so as to extend commissary privileges to civilian officers and employees of the United States at naval stations beyond the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska; and

S. 500 (by request). A bill to provide for the appointment of additional circuit judges; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHEPPARD:

S. 501. A bill for the relief of William H. Innes; to the Committee on Claims.

S. 502. A bill for the relief of Luther Morgan;

S. 503. A bill for the relief of Llewellyn B. Griffith;

S. 504. A bill to provide a right-of-way;

S. 505. A bill authorizing the President of the United States to summon Sam Alexander before an Army retiring board, and for other purposes;

S. 506. A bill to provide for a more efficient and economical mileage table of distances and routes to apply for the payments of travel performed for the United States Government by the military personnel, Coast Guard, Coast and Geodetic Survey, and the Public Health Service;

S. 507. A bill to provide allowances for inactive status training and for uniforms and equipment for certain officers of the Officers' Reserve Corps;

S. 508. A bill to amend the National Defense Act of June 30, 1916, as amended, with respect to the pay and allowances of certain Reserve officers;

S. 509. A bill to add certain lands of the Front Royal Quartermaster Depot Military Reservation, Va., to the Shenandoah National Park, and for other purposes;

S. 510. A bill to authorize certain officers and enlisted men of the United States Army to accept such medals, orders, and decorations as have been tendered them by foreign governments in appreciation of services rendered;

S. 511. A bill for the relief of Dolores P. de Williamson; and

S. 512. A bill for the relief of certain disbursing officers of the Army of the United States and for the settlement of individual claims approved by the War Department; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

S. 513. A bill to provide for the promotion on the retired list of the Navy of Fred G. Leith; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. TYDINGS:

S. 514. A bill for the relief of Christopher C. Cole; to the Committee on Commerce.

S. 515. A bill to exempt from the provisions of draft convention No. 53 of the International Labor Conference Treaty of 1936 all American vessels under 200 tons; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

S. 516. A bill granting a pension to Florence Adele Keyes Gibson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Colorado:

S. 517. A bill to amend the Communications Act of 1934 to prohibit the advertising of alcoholic beverages by radio; to the Committee on Interstate Commerce.

By Mr. TYDINGS and Mr. RADCLIFFE:

S. J. Res. 36. Joint resolution authorizing the restoration and preservation of the frigate *Constellation*, and making Baltimore, Md., her home port; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

#### CHANGE OF REFERENCE

On motion by Mr. TYDINGS, the Committee on Territories and Insular Affairs was discharged from the further consideration of the joint resolution (S. J. Res. 6) to provide for establishing a territorial form of civil government for the District of Columbia, and it was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

#### HEARINGS BEFORE THE COMMITTEE ON COMMERCE

Mr. BAILEY submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 50), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Commerce, or any subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the Seventy-sixth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words, to report such hearings as may be had on any subject before said committee, the expense thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

#### HEARINGS BEFORE COMMITTEE ON POST OFFICES AND POST ROADS

Mr. McKELLAR submitted the following resolution (S. Res. 51), which was referred to the Committee to Audit and Control the Contingent Expenses of the Senate:

*Resolved*, That the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, or any subcommittee thereof, be, and hereby is, authorized during the Seventy-sixth Congress to send for persons, books, and papers, to administer oaths, and to employ a stenographer at a cost not exceeding 25 cents per hundred words; to report such hearings as may be had in connection with any subject which may be before said



committee, the expense thereof to be paid out of the contingent fund of the Senate; and that the committee, or any subcommittee thereof, may sit during any session or recess of the Senate.

#### ADDRESS BY THE PRESIDENT AT CHAPEL HILL, N. C.

[Mr. REYNOLDS asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by the President of the United States at the University of North Carolina, Chapel Hill, N. C., on December 5, 1938, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### NAVAL DEFENSES—ADDRESS BY SENATOR WALSH

[Mr. GERRY asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD a radio address on the subject of naval defenses delivered by Senator WALSH on Monday, January 9, 1939, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### ADDRESS BY SENATOR MALONEY AT CONNECTICUT DEMOCRATIC STATE CONVENTION

[Mr. WALSH asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the address delivered by Senator MALONEY at the Democratic State convention, Groton, Conn., September 13, 1938, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### JACKSON DAY ADDRESS BY ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF WAR JOHNSON

[Mr. HILL asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD the Jackson Day address delivered by Hon. Louis Johnson, Assistant Secretary of War, at Montgomery, Ala., January 7, 1939, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### THE BUSINESSMAN AND CONGRESS—ARTICLE BY J. R. M'CARL

[Mr. BURKE asked and obtained leave to have printed in the RECORD an article by John Raymond McCarl, former Comptroller General of the United States, on the subject The Businessman and Congress published in the New York Sun of January 7, 1939, which appears in the Appendix.]

#### EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

As in executive session,

The VICE PRESIDENT laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received see the end of Senate proceedings.)

#### ADJOURNMENT TO THURSDAY

Mr. BARKLEY. I move that the Senate adjourn until Thursday next.

The VICE PRESIDENT. The question is on the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 12 o'clock and 22 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, January 12, 1939, at 12 o'clock meridian.

#### NOMINATIONS

*Executive nominations received by the Senate January 10, 1939*

##### AMBASSADORS EXTRAORDINARY AND PLENIPOTENTIARY

Spruille Braden, of New York, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Colombia.

Frank P. Corrigan, of Ohio, now Envoy Extraordinary and Minister Plenipotentiary to Panama, to be Ambassador Extraordinary and Plenipotentiary of the United States of America to Venezuela.

##### ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL

Ambrose O'Connell, of New York, now serving under recess appointment as Second Assistant Postmaster General, to be Second Assistant Postmaster General, Post Office Department.

##### FEDERAL TRADE COMMISSION

Robert E. Freer, of Ohio, to be a Federal Trade Commissioner for a term of 7 years from September 26, 1938. (Reappointment.)

##### RAILROAD RETIREMENT BOARD

M. Roland Reed, of Pennsylvania, to be a member of the Railroad Retirement Board for a term of 5 years from August 29, 1938, vice James A. Dailey, term expired.

##### FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION

Norman S. Case, of Rhode Island, to be a member of the Federal Communications Commission for a term of 7 years from July 1, 1938. (Reappointment.)

##### MISSISSIPPI RIVER COMMISSION

Col. Roger G. Powell, Corps of Engineers, United States Army, to be a member of the Mississippi River Commission, vice Col. Francis B. Wilby, Corps of Engineers, relieved.

##### APPOINTMENTS AND PROMOTIONS IN THE NAVY

###### MARINE CORPS

Col. William P. Upshur to be a brigadier general in the Marine Corps from the 29th day of June 1938.

The following-named colonels to be colonels in the Marine Corps, to correct the dates from which they take rank, as previously nominated and confirmed:

Harry Schmidt, from the 1st day of December 1937.

Earl C. Long, from the 1st day of May 1938.

Selden B. Kennedy, from the 1st day of May 1938.

Miles R. Thacher, from the 7th day of May 1938.

Lt. Col. Henry L. Larsen to be a colonel in the Marine Corps from the 2d day of June 1938.

Lt. Col. William H. Rupertus to be a colonel in the Marine Corps from the 29th day of June 1938.

Lt. Col. Harry K. Pickett to be a colonel in the Marine Corps from the 29th day of June 1938.

Lt. Col. Allen H. Turnage to be a colonel in the Marine Corps from the 29th day of June 1938.

Maj. Evans O. Ames to be a lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps from the 7th day of May 1938.

Maj. Emmett W. Skinner to be a lieutenant colonel in the Marine Corps from the 2d day of June 1938.

The following-named majors to be lieutenant colonels in the Marine Corps from the 29th day of June 1938:

Merritt B. Curtis

Raymond E. Knapp

Charles N. Muldrow

Omar T. Pfeiffer

James D. McLean

Lewie G. Merritt

Joseph T. Smith

Claude A. Larkin

Capt. Gordon Hall to be a major in the Marine Corps from the 7th day of May 1938.

The following-named captains to be majors in the Marine Corps from the 29th day of June 1938:

Max D. Smith

Ronald A. Boone

David A. Stafford

William B. Onley

Erwin Mehlinger

James H. Strother

Donald Spicer

Ivan W. Miller

Frank P. Snow

Joe N. Smith

Chesley G. Stevens

Louis E. Marie, Jr.

Walter W. Wensinger

James S. Monahan

Lawson H. M. Sanderson

John A. Bemis

Jacob F. Plachta

John C. McQueen

Harold E. Rosecrans

Howard N. Kenyon

Leo Sullivan

William W. Davies

Hayne D. Boyden

Vernon E. Megee

Franklin G. Cowie

James M. Smith

Christian F. Schilt

Ernest E. Linsert

Walter A. Wachtler

Orin H. Wheeler

William E. Maxwell

Lewis A. Hohn

Clarence R. Wallace

The following-named first lieutenants to be captains in the Marine Corps from the 2d day of June 1938:

Samuel G. Taxis

Chandler W. Johnson

Mercade A. Cramer

George R. Weeks

James B. Lake, Jr.

The following-named first lieutenants to be captains in the Marine Corps from the 30th day of June 1938:

Clifton R. Moss

John B. Hendry

Bankson T. Holcomb, Jr.

Frederick B. Winfree

Frederick L. Wieseman

Samuel D. Fuller

Robert S. Brown

Ernest R. West

Harlan C. Cooper

Roger W. Beadle

Robert E. Fojt

Robert R. Porter

Billy W. King

Ellsworth N. Murray

George R. E. Shell

Howard J. Turton

James H. Brower

Thomas J. Colley

Joseph P. McCaffery

Walter Asmuth, Jr.

The following-named first lieutenants to be captains in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of July 1938:

Alpha L. Bowser, Jr.  
Marvin T. Starr  
George Corson

The following-named second lieutenants to be first lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 6th day of June 1938:

Robert E. Cushman	Elmer T. Dorsey
Charles W. Shelburne	Earl A. Sneeringer
Richard G. Weede	Merlyn D. Holmes
Charles O. Bierman	Lewis J. Fields
Frederick A. Ramsey, Jr.	Bruce T. Hemphill
William N. McGill	James W. Crowther
Carl A. Laster	Edwin P. Pennebaker, Jr.
Leonard K. Davis	Wallace M. Nelson

The following-named second lieutenants to be first lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of July 1938:

Leonard F. Chapman, Jr.	Eugene F. Syms
Dixon Goen	Wilmer E. Barnes
Herman Nickerson, Jr.	John W. Stage
Richard H. Crockett	Kenyth A. Damke
Wesley M. Platt	Kenneth D. Bailey
George A. Roll	Raymond L. Murray
Floyd R. Moore	John S. Oldfield
Chevey S. White	Kenneth A. Jorgensen
Marvin H. Floom	Alexander B. Swenceski
Richard E. Thompson	Julian F. Walters
Kenneth F. McLeod	Hoyt McMillan
Willard C. Fiske	Harry A. Schmitz
James G. Frazer	Herbert R. Amey, Jr.
Robert E. Stannah	Peter J. Negri
Stanley W. Trachta	Frank P. Hager, Jr.
Carey A. Randall	Elmer E. Brackett, Jr.
Ronald B. Wilde	William T. Fairbourn
William S. McCormick	Custis Burton, Jr.
William J. Van Ryzin	Clayton O. Totman
Albert F. Metze	George H. Brockway
Joe C. McHaney	Harold G. Walker
Gould P. Groves	Bruno A. Hochmuth
Donn C. Hart	Thomas F. Riley

The following-named second lieutenants to be first lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 1st day of September 1938:

Frederick P. Henderson	Clyde R. Huddleson
Donald J. Decker	William R. Collins
Michael Sampas	Norman Van Dam
Charles W. Harrison	John J. Nilan, Jr.
Frederick E. Leek	Herbert H. Williamson
William R. Wendt	Leo R. Smith
Arthur A. Chidester	John C. Miller, Jr.
John A. Anderson	Dwight M. Guillotte
Gordon A. Bell	Thomas S. Ivey
Robert A. McGill	Loren S. Fraser
James M. Clark	William E. Boles
Peter J. Speckman	Harry O. Smith, Jr.
Roy L. Kline	Joseph L. Winecoff
Odell M. Conoley	James S. O'Halloran
Louie C. Rineberg	William G. Robb
William W. Buchanan	Ferdinand Bishop
Jack Tabor	Wendell H. Duplantis
John W. Easley	Benjamin L. McMakin
Frank L. Kilmartin	Joseph R. Little, Jr.
Eschol M. Mallory	Lawrence H. McCulley
Robert D. Moser	Alexander A. Vandegrift, Jr.
Joseph N. Renner	Edwin A. Law

The following-named meritorious noncommissioned officers to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 24th day of June 1938:

Sgt. William H. Doolen.  
Corpl. Daniel C. Pollock.  
Corpl. Harvey B. Atkins.  
Corpl. Monfurd K. Peyton.  
Corpl. Lawrence V. Patterson.

The following-named citizens to be second lieutenants in the Marine Corps from the 25th day of June 1938:

Charles W. McCoy, a citizen of Texas.  
Elmer A. Wrenn, a citizen of North Carolina.  
James C. Magee, Jr., a citizen of the District of Columbia.  
Jackson B. Butterfield, a citizen of Vermont.  
Edward N. Rydall, a citizen of California.  
Robert S. Howell, a citizen of New York.  
Jesse P. Ferrill, Jr., a citizen of Florida.  
John W. Burkhardt, a citizen of Colorado.  
William E. Benedict, a citizen of California.  
Maurice W. Fletcher, a citizen of Mississippi.  
Raymond G. Davis, a citizen of Georgia.  
George A. Graves, a citizen of Illinois.  
Thomas L. Ridge, a citizen of Illinois.  
William M. Frash, a citizen of California.  
Harold R. Warner, Jr., a citizen of Washington.  
Lowell E. English, a citizen of Nebraska.  
George H. Cannon, a citizen of Michigan.  
Robert A. Abbott, a citizen of Idaho.  
Ransom M. Wood, a citizen of Alabama.  
Bruce B. Cheever, a citizen of Michigan.  
Albert H. Follmar, a citizen of Oklahoma.  
Guy H. Kissinger, Jr., a citizen of Texas.  
Byron V. Leary, a citizen of Massachusetts.  
John P. Haines, Jr., a citizen of Pennsylvania.  
James R. Christensen, a citizen of Utah.  
Albert J. Roose, a citizen of Ohio.  
Robert F. Steidtmann, a citizen of Virginia.  
Alvin S. Sanders, a citizen of South Carolina.  
Robert B. Chadwick, a citizen of Massachusetts.  
Donn J. Robertson, a citizen of Minnesota.  
Ralph A. Collins, Jr., a citizen of the District of Columbia.  
Edward H. Hurst, a citizen of Georgia.  
Merrill M. Day, a citizen of Missouri.  
Benjamin S. Hargrave, Jr., a citizen of Pennsylvania.  
Walter S. Osipoff, a citizen of Ohio.

Quartermaster Clerk Alexander N. Entringer to be a chief quartermaster clerk in the Marine Corps, to rank with but after second lieutenant, from the 7th day of June 1938.

Quartermaster Clerk Samuel G. Thompson to be a chief quartermaster clerk in the Marine Corps, to rank with but after second lieutenant, from the 20th day of June 1938.

Pay Clerk Emmett G. Hall to be a chief pay clerk in the Marine Corps, to rank with but after second lieutenant, from the 28th day of June 1938.

Pay Clerk Charles T. Gates to be a chief pay clerk in the Marine Corps, to rank with but after second lieutenant, from the 28th day of June 1938.

Marine Gunner Albert S. Munsch to be a chief marine gunner in the Marine Corps, to rank with but after second lieutenant, from the 23d day of December 1938.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, JANUARY 10, 1939

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Spirit of Truth, send us forth today in obedience to the imperative command of our commission. Thou who made known our Father's name, warm our hearts with the splendor of that revelation; deliver us from the spirit of fearfulness. Merciful God, move our country into a wider, broader day and let it be blest not with corruptible things but with justice, good will, and brotherhood. Behind and beneath all are the potencies of love and longing which Thou alone can satisfy. Forbid, blessed Lord, that we should stand by the sea of human life and realize no God and see no home beyond the horizon. Take unto Thy care our President, our Speaker, and the whole congressional body; put Thy seal upon us and a deep consciousness of our sonship in our breasts. Through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.



## MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Sundry messages in writing from the President of the United States were communicated to the House by Mr. Hess, one of his secretaries.

## MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that Mr. BULOW, of South Dakota, had been appointed as a member of the Joint Committee on Forestry on the part of the Senate, vice Hon. William Gibbs McAdoo, resigned, in accordance with the provisions of Senate Concurrent Resolution 31, Seventy-fifth Congress, first session.

The message also announced that Mr. LOGAN, of Kentucky, had been appointed as a member of the Joint Committee to Investigate the Adequacy and Use of the Phosphate Resources of the United States on the part of the Senate to fill the vacancy caused by the expiration of the term of service of Hon. James P. Pope, former Senator from the State of Idaho.

The message also announced that the Vice President had appointed Mr. BARKLEY and Mr. GIBSON members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of February 16, 1889, as amended by the act of March 2, 1895, entitled "An act to authorize and provide for the disposition of useless papers in the executive departments," for the disposition of executive papers in the following departments and agencies:

1. Census of Partial Employment, Unemployment, and Occupations.
2. Tennessee Valley Authority.
3. Smithsonian Institution.
4. Veterans' Administration.
5. Department of Agriculture.
6. Department of the Interior.
7. Department of War.
8. Department of State.

## WAGES PAID W. P. A. WORKERS

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. TARVER. Mr. Speaker, I hold in my hand a statement furnished me by the Works Progress Administration showing the minimum and maximum wages paid to the various types of labor employed by the W. P. A. in the 48 States of the Union and in the District of Columbia. This information I know is of interest to the House at a time when we are about to begin the consideration of the deficiency W. P. A. appropriation bill. I understand that the information does not appear in the hearings which have been had before the deficiency subcommittee, and for that reason I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD at this point by incorporating this statement, which comprises only one page.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The statement is as follows:

	Unskilled		Intermediate		Skilled		Professional and technical	
	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low
United States:								
Alabama.....	\$0.40	\$0.19	\$0.60	\$0.24	\$1.50	\$0.31	\$1.11	\$0.34
Arizona.....	.50	.36	.75	.41	1.00	.56	1.25	.62
Arkansas.....	.28	.20	.55	.25	1.25	.33	.70	.36
California.....	.81	.33	1.45	.38	1.75	.46	1.67	.51
Colorado.....	.72	.30	1.00	.41	1.50	.50	1.07	.56
Connecticut.....	.50	.40	1.05	.45	1.65	.57	1.30	.63
Delaware.....	.41½	.24	.90	.28	1.50	.34	1.36	.60
Florida.....	.30	.19	.73	.24	1.75	.32	1.05	.35
Georgia.....	.30	.20	.43	.25	1.25	.33	1.50	.36
Idaho.....	.55	.28½	.62½	.32	.78½	.39	.86	.43½
Illinois.....	1.02½	.31	1.37½	.33	1.95	.39½	1.50	.44
Indiana.....	.95	.40	1.10	.41	1.50	.46	1.66	.50
Iowa.....	.67½	.31	1.20	.35	1.50	.43	1.50	.47
Kansas.....	.60	.27	.85	.32	1.87	.37	.81	.41
Kentucky.....	.50	.25	1.37½	.35	1.75	.31	1.17½	.34

	Unskilled		Intermediate		Skilled		Professional and technical	
	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low	High	Low
United States—Con.								
Louisiana.....	\$0.35	\$0.20	\$1.00	\$0.25	\$1.38	\$0.32	\$1.50	\$0.35
Maine.....	.40	.31	.70	.35	1.35	.45	1.60	.49
Maryland.....	.44	.25	.55	.32	1.60	.33	1.10	.48
Massachusetts.....	.35	.35	1.50	.39	1.66½	.48	1.60	.53
Michigan.....	.60	.33	1.00	.37½	1.58½	.45½	1.47	.50½
Minnesota.....	.68½	.32	1.15	.41	1.50	.46	1.79	.55½
Mississippi.....	.40	.19	.90	.25	1.50	.31½	2.50	.40
Missouri.....	.50	.25	.68	.30	.88	.34	.82	.38
Montana.....	.75½	.45½	1.12	.41	1.77½	.50	.96	.55½
Nebraska.....	.47	.30	.70	.33	1.37½	.40	1.00	.46
Nevada.....	.62½	.48½	1.50	.55	2.00	.67	2.00	.74½
New Hampshire.....	.45	.35	.66	.43	1.30	.53	1.00	.51
New Jersey.....	.50	.25	1.30½	.35	2.25	.39	1.50	.44
New Mexico.....	.40	.29	1.00	.35	1.50	.43	.86	.68
New York.....	.62½	.26	1.25	.33	2.00	.39½	1.41	.43½
North Carolina.....	.29	.20	.64	.25	1.00	.34	.91	.60
North Dakota.....	.48	.40	.55	.45	1.35	.55	.77	.61
Ohio.....	.679	.31	1.25	.35	2.00	.43	2.50	.47½
Oklahoma.....	.41	.25	.73	.35	1.60	.43	1.00	.47
Oregon.....	.50	.34	.80	.38	1.50	.46	1.25	.51
Pennsylvania.....	.65	.50	1.24½	.57	2.00	.65½	3.03	.71½
Rhode Island.....	.50	.40	.59½	.46½	1.50	.61	.78½	.67½
South Carolina.....	.27½	.19	.48	.24	1.25	.32	.52½	.34½
South Dakota.....	.40	.37	.42	.38	1.37½	.46	.58	.55
Tennessee.....	.30	.18	.43	.23	1.62	.31	.64	.35
Texas.....	.35	.20	.55	.26	1.50	.32	1.22	.35
Utah.....	.50	.41	.75	.50	1.50	.63	1.00	.70
Vermont.....	.40	.32	.50	.35	1.25	.43	1.10	.48
Virginia.....	.40	.19	.57	.24	1.50	.31	1.50	.34
Washington.....	.58	.34	.99	.38	1.67	.46	1.44	.44
West Virginia.....	.45	.40	.58	.47	.84	.64	.90	.84
Wisconsin.....	1.00	.33½	1.22	.37½	1.66	.39½	1.51	.43½
Wyoming.....	.42	.42	.48	.47½	.61½	.58	.66	.64
New York City.....	.93	.46½	1.57	.48	2.21	.589	1.518	.70
District of Columbia.....	.50	.33	1.15	.43	2.00	.67	1.22	.76

† Exclusive of New York City.

## REGENTS OF SMITHSONIAN INSTITUTION

The SPEAKER. Pursuant to the provisions of title 20, section 43, United States Code, the Chair appoints as regents of the Smithsonian Institution the following Members of the House: Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH, of Maryland, Mr. CANNON of Missouri, Mr. GIFFORD, of Massachusetts.

## EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD by inserting therein an address delivered by our former colleague, Hon. Arthur P. Lamneck, of Ohio, over the Columbia Broadcasting System on December 17, 1938.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

## RECIPROCAL-TRADE AGREEMENTS

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] is recognized for 40 minutes.

## THE GENERAL DOWNWARD TARIFF REVISION UNDER THE TRADE-TREATY PROGRAM

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, since the adjournment of the Seventy-fifth Congress the administration has entered into two new trade treaties—one with Great Britain, the other with Canada—the purpose and effect of which will be to further encourage importations of competitive foreign products which displace the products of our own farms and factories and take jobs away from our workers. I wonder if this House and the country realize that approximately 1,000 reductions in tariff duties ranging up to 50 percent have now been made under the treaty program.

With our home market already glutted with surplus agricultural products and our farmers subject to production control, with farm prices the lowest in years, with mills and factories either idle or on a part-time basis, with millions of unemployed still roaming the streets in search of work that is not to be found, with economic recovery dependent in a large measure upon confidence in the future, the administration has nevertheless continued to pursue its ruinous tariff policy which can only result in adding to our ills.

## PROGRAM BASED ON FALSE PREMISE

The trade treaty program is based upon the fallacious premise that we can restore prosperity at home by giving up our rich domestic market to other countries, which would then, it is said, have more purchasing power with which to buy American goods. Of course, the fact is that foreign countries, while they will take advantage of every opportunity to flood our market with their own cheap products, will nevertheless buy what they need in the cheapest market, wherever that may be, and there is nothing in the terms of the trade treaties to prevent them from doing so. Indeed, the trade treaties do not compel them to buy a single dollar's worth of our goods with the purchasing power they obtain by selling their own products in the American market. This fact was admitted by Secretary Wallace in his annual report for the fiscal year 1934, and what he feared might happen has happened.

## TREATY PROGRAM RECALLS ONE OF AÆSOP'S FABLES

When we consider that we consume at home 90 percent or more of what we produce, it must be obvious that our prosperity is almost wholly dependent upon the domestic market and not the relatively lean foreign market. The trade-treaty program follows the absurd theory that the "tail wags the dog."

Speaking of dogs, I am reminded that the treaty program places this country in somewhat the same position as the dog in AÆsop's Fables, about which we have all read. It will be recalled that he carried a bone in his mouth, and in passing over a stream saw in the water what appeared to be another dog with a bone. In his anxiety to grasp the bone from the dog that appeared in the water, he lost the bone which he already had. Substitute our rich domestic market for the bone in the dog's mouth, and the lean and illusory foreign markets for the image in the stream, and you have a perfect analogy to the present trade-treaty program.

## ONLY JUSTIFICATION FOR FOREIGN TRADE IS TO EXCHANGE OUR SURPLUSES FOR THINGS WE NEED

Mr. Speaker, it can hardly be denied that the only purpose of carrying on foreign trade is to exchange our surpluses for the things we need but do not produce ourselves. The importation of the latter class of articles injures no domestic industry and no group of workers. The quantity of such goods annually purchased by us furnishes ample dollar exchange for the purchase of our own surpluses by foreign countries.

There is no need or justification for buying foreign products the like of which we already produce for ourselves. An individual, for example, would not buy potatoes from his neighbor if he produced an ample supply of his own, and this should be equally true of a nation.

## TREATY CONCESSIONS LARGELY ON FOREIGN PRODUCTS THAT DISPLACE OUR OWN

The trade-treaty program, if it were restricted to making concessions on noncompetitive foreign products, would conceivably be of great benefit to this country, but since it is largely confined to widespread and drastic reductions of duties on foreign products that directly compete with and displace our own, its effect can only be to injure American producers.

It is idle for the apologists for the trade-treaty program to contend that these tariff reductions will not seriously affect American agriculture, industry, or labor. The purpose of the reductions admittedly is to allow foreign countries to sell us more of their goods. Why else are they being made? And if such is not the case, would anyone suppose that the foreign countries would have signed the treaties?

We must accept as a premise the fact that the purpose of the treaty program is to make possible and encourage increased imports of competitive foreign products. Proceeding from this premise, it follows that increased imports of competitive foreign products means less goods produced in the United States. And it follows, further, that less goods made in the United States means less work for our own men and women.

It has been truly said that there is need for putting more purchasing power in the hands of the great masses of the

people, but this cannot be brought about by denying American farmers and American workmen the opportunity to produce the goods consumed in the home market. Nor can it be brought about by forcing them to compete with the products of the cheap labor of Europe and the Orient. Even if the tariff reductions made under the treaties do not in every case actually result in displacing American goods, they at least force a reduction in wage levels if our own producers are to continue to compete with foreigners for the home market.

## TREATY PROGRAM DISCRIMINATES AGAINST CERTAIN GROUPS OF WORKERS TO HELP OTHERS

The administration, under the trade-treaty program, is supposedly trying to help certain branches of industry and agriculture by sacrificing others to foreign competition. In other words, it is taking from Peter to give to Paul. Aside from the fact that one American citizen has as much right to a livelihood as another, the Nation as a whole gains nothing by such unfair and discriminatory procedure. Even if the trade we lose in the domestic market is offset by increased foreign sales, we are in no better position than before. Certainly the workers who have lost their jobs are not better off. But when these increased exports fail to materialize, as is usually the case, we are playing a losing game all the way around.

When the Czech treaty was concluded, the shoe workers of Massachusetts who were injured thereby were told by the administration spokesman that they would indirectly benefit from the increased prosperity which would come to Detroit auto workers by reason of increased exports of American cars to Czechoslovakia. But the fact was overlooked that the Detroit auto workers would use their increased purchasing power, if any, not to buy shoes from Massachusetts but to buy the cheap shoes of Czechoslovakia which would flood our market under the treaty. Moreover, there is some question as to just how much the purchasing power of Detroit auto workers will be increased, since under the treaty the quota on American cars is limited to 1,600 per year, and there will still be a tariff of \$595 imposed, which few people in that country can pay, not to mention the cost of gasoline to run them.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?  
Mr. TREADWAY. Very briefly.

Mr. KNUTSON. So that I may read at this time into the gentleman's remarks a very pertinent and interesting item that appeared in the Washington Post this morning. It appears that 10 Senators, most of them Democrats, are asking for an investigation of the Cuban reciprocal-trade agreement. They contend that Cuban officials announced in Habana on November 28 that a new agreement had been concluded with this Government, while the State Department here said on December 1 that hearings would be held January 3 on the matter.

In other words, according to the contention of these Senators, most of whom are Democrats, the State Department agreed to hold hearings on the Cuban treaty after it had been ratified and accepted.

Mr. TREADWAY. I am not at all surprised at that statement. Where has the Congress, either the Senate or the House, or Democrats or Republicans, been consulted at any time in relation to the trade-treaty program? The newspaper item to which the gentleman referred only carries out that very idea that they open the barn door and let in importations and then hear you talk about it.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman will recall that when the reciprocal-trade bill was before the House, the gentleman himself offered an amendment that would have compelled House and Senate ratification of the trade agreements before they would become effective, and it was voted down on a strict party vote, the Democrats voting against it and Republicans for it.

Mr. TREADWAY. And I have not gotten discouraged, I may say to the gentleman. I have reintroduced that measure and will refer to it later in my remarks.

Mr. KNUTSON. And may I say to the gentleman that it will not do any good until 1941 to do so.



Mr. TREADWAY. But I say it will do good, because it will call attention of the country to the iniquity of the program as being carried out by the Democratic majority, reduced as it is.

Mr. KNUTSON. Oh, yes; it will accelerate the movement back to sanity.

Mr. TREADWAY. Correct. Therefore, it is useful.

Mr. MICHENER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes.

Mr. MICHENER. The gentleman from Minnesota should not be surprised at the article in the Post this morning, for if he will think back when the Brazilian treaty was under consideration some of us on this side wanted to get information about what was being considered. We were unable to get it at the State Department, but we did get it through the Brazilian foreign representative, because in Brazil the Congress must ratify before the treaty is entered into, whereas in this country the President and the Secretary of State enter into a treaty and then we are permitted to go through the form of a hearing.

Mr. TREADWAY. Let me call the gentleman's attention further to the fact that when this treaty with Great Britain was up for consideration a stuffed committee was appointed to hear us people against it. Does the gentleman suppose this protest had the least effect on the men ready to render their decision before the hearing was held?

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. At this point it might be pertinent to have the Record show that we are the only country that does not require congressional action on trade agreements.

Mr. TREADWAY. The gentleman is correct insofar as the great majority of the countries are concerned, as I shall later show. We have much less to say about what is being done than other legislative bodies in foreign countries.

Mr. KNUTSON. We have absolutely nothing to say.

#### TREATY WITH GREAT BRITAIN DOUBLES NUMBER OF TARIFF REDUCTIONS

Mr. TREADWAY. Following these general remarks—and I want to say that I am glad to have the interpolations by others—I desire to briefly review the new British trade treaty, as well as the revised Canadian treaty, which takes the place of the one previously negotiated.

I shall discuss first the British treaty, which became effective on January 1.

Some idea of the scope of the treaty may be gained from the astounding fact that this country made 468 actual duty reductions, or approximately as many as had been made under all the 17 previous treaties. Other concessions included the binding of 47 duties against increase during the life of the treaty and the binding of 106 articles on the free list.

That shows the scope of the British treaty. Practically as many reductions in tariff rates were made in that one treaty as in the previous 17. I submit those 468 reductions are practically all on competitive articles, the like of which are manufactured by our own industries or produced by our own farmers in this country.

The actual number of tariff concessions made under the treaty does not tell the whole story. It is the fact that they affect approximately 70 percent of our imports from the United Kingdom that is important; likewise, the fact that they affect 94 percent of our imports from the British colonial empire.

Mr. SHORT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. Nothing would give me greater satisfaction than to have the endorsement of the gentleman from Missouri. [Laughter.]

Mr. SHORT. I merely wanted to point out to the gentleman that on November 17, about 9 days after the election, it was made public that the treaty with Canada had been consummated. Although it did not go into effect until January 1, the price of lead and zinc ore, much of which is produced in my congressional district, dropped \$5 a ton. Many of the mines in southwestern Missouri, northeastern Oklahoma, and southeastern Kansas closed, and over 4,000 miners have been thrown out of employment.

Mr. TREADWAY. I am certain the gentleman from Missouri impressed those facts on the voters in his election district previous to the election period.

Mr. SHORT. I predicted, I may say, the week before election that the treaty would not be made public until after the election.

Does not the gentleman believe that a great mistake was made when, in 1934, the Congress of the United States abdicated its power and turned over to the Executive the authority to negotiate those treaties without them ever being considered, let alone ratified, by the United States Senate, as is required by the Constitution?

Mr. TREADWAY. During the 26 years I have been a Member of this body, if there is any one subject I have dwelt on more than another, it is the iniquity of our agreeing to those trade treaties without any authority from the Congress whatsoever.

Mr. RICH. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield.

Mr. RICH. Does the gentleman have an idea that the Congress, at this session, will assume its responsibility and take that power back unto itself, where it rightfully belongs, so that we can determine whether we want imports of foreign countries to come in here and put our men out of work and put our farmers off of their farms?

Mr. TREADWAY. My answer to the gentleman from Pennsylvania is this: We have, I believe, at least 80 new Members on this side of the House. I am very confident that every one of those 80 will vote with those of us who have been here before against these treaties. The answer to the gentleman's question is in the hands of the gentlemen of the majority. If there are enough of those gentlemen over there with the same sanity that the gentleman from Pennsylvania has, we will abrogate those treaties during the Seventy-sixth Congress.

Mr. RICH. I will say that I believe there are enough Jeffersonian Democrats in the House today who will come to the rescue of the American workingman, the American businessman, and the American farmer. I am in hopes that that will happen at this session of the Congress.

Mr. TREADWAY. As I understand it, that group was purged on Saturday night from the Democratic Party by the speech of the President. He does not want their society any more.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield.

Mr. KNUTSON. The gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SHORT] mentioned the great mistake that was made back in 1934. May I remind the gentleman from Missouri that a much greater mistake was made 2 years previously. [Laughter.]

Mr. TREADWAY. The gentleman's remark was correct in that for a year or two after they came into office they did not bring up their trade-treaty program.

Mr. SHORT. I may say further, if the gentleman will allow, that I have just come from my office, where I had a telephone call from a gentleman by the name of June Walker, who was sent up here by the mine workers themselves from Picher, Okla., in the congressional district of my worthy colleague the gentleman from Oklahoma, Mr. DISNEY. We are meeting this afternoon in Senator THOMAS' office at 4 o'clock. I invite all the Members of this House, on both sides of the aisle, who are interested in seeing lead and zinc exempted from this reciprocal-trade agreement to meet with us.

Mr. RICH. Why limit it to those interested in lead and zinc?

Mr. TREADWAY. I want to continue briefly, if I may, along my own line, welcoming these interruptions as applicable.

#### WHOLE WORLD GETS BENEFIT OF OUR REDUCTIONS IN TARIFF RATES

It should, of course, be kept in mind that under the administration's so-called most-favored-nation policy the concessions which this country makes under all trade treaties except the Cuban are extended freely to all other countries, save Germany, without requiring these other countries to give us reciprocal concessions in return. Hence to call the treaty program "reciprocity" is a misnomer.

For all practical purposes the tariff reductions made under the treaties have the same effect upon world imports as if they had been made by statute. What the treaty program is doing is to bring about, piecemeal, a general downward tariff revision all along the line. I recall that when he was majority leader the late Speaker Rainey once said to this House—and I was sitting on the floor when he made this remark. I quote:

Lower this tariff drastically? You (Republicans) will not do it and we (Democrats) dare not do it with conditions as they are. We do not want this market flooded with the products of cheap labor in other countries.

I would almost think that Speaker Rainey would turn in his grave could he see what has been done by his former colleagues since he made that statement on this floor.

What the present administration does not have the courage to do directly by legislation it is doing indirectly through the means of trade treaties. Even in connection with its backhanded method of tariff revision it has shown a distinct lack of political courage, as evidenced by the fact that the announcement of the British treaty was withheld until after the election last fall, although its terms had already been agreed upon.

And I will pause at this point to say that in many instances during the campaign I made that statement, and I defied any of the Democratic powers to produce what was to be contained in that treaty. They did not, however, dare do it. The reason they did not dare do it was that instead of 80 we might have had 180 new Members on the Republican side—if they had announced that program in advance.

#### ARTICLES AFFECTED BY TARIFF REDUCTIONS UNDER BRITISH TREATY

Time does not permit me to refer to the six-hundred-odd concessions of one kind or another granted to Great Britain, but it must be obvious from their large number that they will adversely affect a major part of our domestic industries which will henceforth find it more difficult, if not impossible, to compete in the home market against the products not only of Great Britain but the rest of the world.

Among the articles on which duty reductions of up to 50 percent were made were some 39 items in the chemical schedule; 27 items in the earthenware and glassware schedule, including bath bricks, tiles, china clay, earthenware, bone china, and glassware; 111 items in the metal schedule, including wire rope, balls and rollers for bearings, power cables, pens, telegraph apparatus, most electrical products, knives, razor blades, rifles, bicycles, and a wide variety of machinery and miscellaneous items; 2 items in the wood schedule, including furniture; three items in the sugar schedule, including molasses and confectionery; 2 items in the tobacco schedule, including cigarettes; 31 items in the agricultural schedule, including venison, fish, oatmeal, biscuits, blueberries, limes, jellies, and so forth; 8 items in the wines and liquor schedule; 40 items in the cotton schedule, including cotton yarn and cloth, and various manufactures of cotton; 30 items in the schedule covering flax, linen, hemp, and jute products; 50 items in the wool schedule, including wool waste and yarns and practically all woven fabrics of wool and manufactures thereof; 6 items in the silk schedule; 24 items in the paper and book schedule; and 95 items in the sundries schedule, including asbestos products, golf balls and clubs, golf tees, toilet brushes, toys, nettings, leather, shoes, gloves, and fishing tackle.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GIFFORD. Before the gentleman concludes, I hope he will weigh the results of the evangelistic appeals for peace and good neighborliness among nations. Has there been actual result?

Mr. TREADWAY. The fact that we are being called upon for the largest appropriation ever made for the so-called national-defense program would indicate to me that the effort to secure peace with our neighbors and friends of other nations has absolutely failed.

Mr. GIFFORD. The gentleman listened to the President's message the other day. Was that a good-neighbor address?

Mr. TREADWAY. I would prefer to have some gentleman from the other side of the aisle defend the President's address rather than that I be asked.

Mr. GROSS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield briefly.

Mr. GROSS. It so happened that yesterday morning I marketed a load of fat cattle on the Lancaster, Pa., market. Farmers from a number of counties had cattle there. Permit me to say on this matter of reciprocal-trade agreements that they are matters of common conversation among those farmers and cattle feeders and dairymen of southeastern Pennsylvania.

Mr. TREADWAY. And they realize what is happening to their industry and their livelihood by the carrying out of these trade treaties, do they not?

Mr. GROSS. They are a unit in their opposition to this program. Our industrial men are of the same opinion about it. There is general opposition to the trade-treaty program throughout that great district.

Mr. TREADWAY. Now, let me return to the industries of Massachusetts.

#### NEW ENGLAND INDUSTRIES SACRIFICED UNDER BRITISH TREATY

The concessions made under the British treaty more seriously affect New England than any other section of the country. The industries of that section are being sacrificed in what will undoubtedly be a fruitless effort to help the export trade of other sections, as I shall presently show. This administration will have to assume full responsibility for the consequences. The people of New England are already aroused over the lack of consideration shown for them, and when the full effect of the tariff reductions begins to be felt they may be expected to show their resentment by actions rather than words.

There is not a single major industry of my State that will not be injured by the treaty. You can go right down the line of the principal industries—those giving the largest employment and upon which the prosperity of Massachusetts principally depends—and you will find that they have all been traded off by the administration, along with the workers employed therein. These industries include shoes, leather goods, cotton textiles, woolen and worsted goods, electrical machinery, textile machinery, paper, confectionery, cutlery, and so on. In addition, there are a host of other lesser industries adversely affected which, while perhaps not as important to the Commonwealth as a whole, are frequently the source of livelihood of whole communities.

I may say that I represent a large number of small towns in which there is likely to be one small industry, comparatively small, but it is the livelihood of that whole community. These treaties are closing these little shops and causing the hardships from which they are suffering in those communities today.

The jobs of thousands of workers employed in our industries have been turned over to workers in foreign countries. The fact that workers in other sections and in other industries may possibly be benefited thereby is beside the point. The administration has no right to discriminate against or in favor of any of our citizens. It has no right to impoverish one group to help another. Its action in bringing about such a result under the treaty program is to be severely condemned.

Of course, the full extent of the injury that will be afflicted upon American producers by the British treaty is speculative at this time. Until the treaty has been in operation for at least a year we will not know what all the consequences will be. But this much we do know: The purpose of the reduction in our tariff rates, as admitted by administration spokesmen, is to make possible increased imports, which are already coming into our market in large volume despite the statutory tariff rates. This is especially true of cotton cloth, the imports of which have tremendously increased in the last few years, particularly from Japan.



Japan, I may say, will, along with other low-wage countries, get the full benefit of the reductions under the British treaty, thus making possible even greater imports of cotton cloth which will displace that which ordinarily would be produced in our own mills by American working men and women.

That situation, so far as importations from Japan are concerned, ought to be a subject of discussion alone as an argument against this trade-treaty program.

That a reduction in our tariff duties on competitive foreign products jeopardizes the jobs of American workers is plain. When the hearings were held on the British treaty, prior to its negotiation, representatives of numerous labor groups appeared to protest against such reductions. The workers of America know that they cannot compete on equal terms with the cheap labor of other countries. They realize that the tariff is all that stands between them and the low-wage scales and living standards which obtain in other countries.

#### BRITISH CONCESSIONS OF LITTLE OR NO VALUE

As compared with this country's sweeping concessions under the British treaty, which, as I have said, are extended to all other countries but one, let us see what was obtained for the United States in the way of concessions from Great Britain.

First, as to agricultural exports: Concessions to this country, including, in addition to duty concessions, the binding of other rates of duty at existing levels and the freezing of items on the British free list, purport to cover a large part of our exports of farm products to the United Kingdom, thus making it appear that for once we are actually getting some worthwhile concessions for our farmers. But the joker is that while some duty reductions have been granted on a few specialty items, no real concessions are extended to the major farm exports.

#### EMPTY "CONCESSIONS" ON COTTON AND TOBACCO

Cotton is our chief export to the United Kingdom, and since time immemorial it has been on the free list. Hence all that was or could be done for American cotton under the British treaty was to bind it on the free list, which, of course, does not assure any increased exports of that commodity.

It has always been a favorite argument of trade treaty proponents that the reason our foreign trade in certain farm products had disappeared was because of the erection of retaliatory tariffs against us. The fact that cotton is and has been on the British free list is evidence that this is not so. There are other reasons for the loss of our foreign markets, particularly as regards cotton. Cotton production has been opened up in many new countries and expanded in old production areas. Our cotton exports have fallen off because of increased competition for world markets and the fact that other countries are producing their own. Under the circumstances it is almost hopeless to expect to increase our cotton exports. Likewise it is a losing proposition to bargain away our rich domestic market in the hope of finding export markets for cotton, particularly when the only alleged concession we obtain is preservation of the status quo so far as tariff treatment for our cotton is concerned.

Mr. BREWSTER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield to the gentleman from Maine.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is it not the theory of the advocates of these agreements that we sell as much as we buy? Is not that their contention in favor of these agreements?

Mr. TREADWAY. But we do not agree with that program.

Mr. BREWSTER. Is not that their contention?

Mr. TREADWAY. Yes.

Mr. BREWSTER. Has the gentleman examined the result of the first agreement with Cuba wherein before the agreement the balance of trade was \$14,000,000 in their favor, whereas in the first 2 years after the agreement it was \$132,000,000 in their favor? What is the effect of that \$132,000,000 balance upon the wage earners of this country?

Mr. TREADWAY. I think anyone engaged in beet growing or cane growing in this country would be of the opinion that they will find themselves down and out.

Mr. BREWSTER. It means they are put out of business.

Mr. TREADWAY. I received a letter this morning, and probably the other Members of Congress did, from the distinguished Member from Michigan [Mr. WOODRUFF], covering the very point to which the gentleman is referring.

Mr. BREWSTER. Has the gentleman followed the announcement of Colonel Batista regarding the agreement he made with the State Department on his recent visit?

Mr. TREADWAY. I regret to say I have not that information at hand, but I would be very glad to have the gentleman give it.

Mr. BREWSTER. Colonel Batista announced that he made an agreement with the State Department, although no hearings whatsoever had been held. Is that within their power?

Mr. TREADWAY. What difference does it make whether they have hearings or not, as long as they have decided what they are going to do before they have hearings? I think they might as well throw aside that camouflage and make the trade agreements without any hearings. It does not do any good to have hearings. The gentleman appeared with me at hearings last spring. Where did we get before a packed committee? It was a committee set up to defeat us before we started.

Mr. BREWSTER. That was the result.

Mr. TREADWAY. That is what was intended, too.

To return to the treaty with Great Britain:

Unmanufactured tobacco usually is our second most important export to the United Kingdom. Yet the only alleged concession obtained for that product was an assurance that the present margin of preference accorded to tobacco from the British colonies, now amounting to 50 cents per pound, would not be increased. In other words, under the treaty, our tobacco exporters will continue to be at the same competitive disadvantage in the British market as heretofore. Thus on our two principal exports to the United Kingdom we got no actual concessions.

Wheat also has always been an important export to the United Kingdom, and our treaty negotiators did succeed in getting a small concession on this product, namely, the removal of the so-called Empire preference amounting to 6 cents per bushel. However, it should be understood that the Empire countries are able to supply all British requirements for wheat and they will still enjoy advantages in production costs which will enable them to retain their present market in the United Kingdom.

A number of alleged concessions were granted by the United Kingdom on other less important agricultural commodities, but in a great many instances they amounted to no more than slightly increasing some quotas, or binding existing rates of duty, or agreeing not to increase the unfavorable position of the United States in the British market. Hence there is little likelihood of any substantial benefit to American agriculture under the treaty.

#### MOST CONCESSIONS ON NONAGRICULTURAL EXPORTS CONSIST OF BINDING EXISTING TARIFF TREATMENT

As regards the so-called concessions made by the United Kingdom on nonagricultural products of the United States, it will be found that they, too, hold little hope of substantial benefit to this country. The United Kingdom normally takes only about one-tenth of the total American exports of this class of goods. Total concessions on such products cover exports which in 1936 amounted to \$30,000,000, or about 40 percent of the total nonagricultural exports to that country. However, duty reductions were granted only on about one-third of these commodities, the alleged concessions on the remainder consisting merely of binding the present tariff treatment or the existing Empire margin of preference, which, of course, will not be of any increased benefit to American products.

Taking both agricultural and nonagricultural concessions together, the commodities on which improved tariff treatment is accorded to American products under the British treaty accounted for only about \$50,000,000 of our exports to the United Kingdom out of a total in 1936 of \$440,000,000.

Agricultural products accorded improved tariff treatment accounted for \$26,000,000 and nonagricultural products for \$24,000,000.

The great majority of the so-called concessions made by the British colonies to American exports consisted of binding existing tariff treatment and Empire preferences, the actual duty concessions being limited to reductions on American products which in 1936 were imported into the colonies to the amount of only \$4,439,000. Of this total, but \$673,000 was in American agricultural products.

#### WHAT PRICE RECIPROCITY?

Judging from the one-sided nature of the British treaty it is apparent that this country paid a tremendous price for its negotiation. It must be that Secretary Hull was more interested in consequences and considerations other than trade advantages for this country. Before the treaty negotiations began, a British trade paper suggested that Great Britain had everything to lose and nothing to gain as a result of a treaty with the United States since it was already obtaining the benefits of concessions made under other American trade treaties without giving up anything in return. Perhaps that explains why we had to give up so much more to obtain so little.

It is well known that Secretary Hull looked forward to the negotiation of the British treaty as his crowning achievement, and he was doubtless willing to pay any price to secure an agreement. Our citizens may well concern themselves as to whether additional commitments were made which do not consist of mere tariff concessions—secret commitments which may involve this country in entangling foreign alliances. There is at least reason for believing that the treaty was greatly desired simply for the psychological effect it would have on certain other countries which I need not mention.

One of the responsible officials of the State Department has publicly stated that the purpose of the trade-treaty program must be broader than "mere horse trading" or "selfish trade advantages." If that is the view taken by the treaty negotiators, then it explains a great deal, not only the failure to secure for this country an even exchange but the fact that considerations other than trade may be involved.

Secretary Hull takes great satisfaction in the approval of his trade-treaty program by the Lima Conference which was recently held. Of course it is not hard to understand why the South American countries should be wholeheartedly in favor of our treaty program, which is a part of the administration's "good neighbor" policy. Why should they not be in favor of it, since its purpose is to let them send more goods into our market to displace our own products? It is just like the administration's spending program: Nobody is going to shoot Santa Claus.

#### THE NEW TREATY WITH CANADA

Turning to the new trade treaty with Canada, I may say that it is, of course, in substitution for the previously existing agreement which became effective January 1, 1936. The new treaty continues most of the important concessions made on both sides under the previous agreement, enlarges upon some, and in addition provides for a considerable number of new concessions.

#### OUR CONCESSIONS AFFECT 83 PERCENT OF CANADIAN IMPORTS

Concessions on the part of this country under the new Canadian treaty affect 83 percent of all our imports from Canada in 1937, indicating virtually a complete tariff revision insofar as Canadian imports are concerned. Of the dutiable imports, articles imported in 1937 to a value of about \$73,000,000 have been granted increased concessions over those made under the old treaty. These concessions include reductions in the duties on brick, lime, cement, not specially provided for, crude feldspar, mica, talc, woven-wire cloth, objects of cast iron, iron and steel chains, motorboats, aluminum, nickel, zinc, veneers of birch and maple, certain manufactures of wood, and maple sugar and sirup.

As regards agricultural products, the quota on dairy cows was removed and the quotas on calves, cattle, and seed pota-

toes were increased, along with a reduction in the duty on the latter two items. Duties were also reduced on pork and swine, bacon, milk and cream (subject to quota), Cheddar cheese, eggs, horses, honey, barley, buckwheat, oats, rye, bran shorts, dried beet pulp, blueberries, certain seeds, white or Irish potatoes (subject to quota), hay, and straw. Among other products on which duty reductions were made were fish, paper, fox furs, patent leather, leather gloves, pipe organs, and Christmas trees.

#### AGRICULTURAL TARIFFS NOW DRASTICALLY REDUCED

As a result of the new concessions, the rates of duty on many agricultural products have now been reduced under the rates of the tariff acts of 1921 (emergency act), 1922, and 1930. In other words, the existing rates approach the level of the free-trade Underwood Act of 1913, under which most agricultural products were on the free list. The consequences of free trade or inadequate tariffs on farm products are a matter of history. The outbreak of the World War in 1914 set up an artificial tariff barrier for the time and saved this country from foreign competition. However, with the signing of the armistice and the resumption of production abroad, the flood of foreign imports broke loose upon our market, displacing our own farm products and breaking down the price structure. A Republican Congress in 1920 passed an emergency agricultural tariff bill which was vetoed by President Wilson.

However, it was reintroduced under President Harding and became a law in 1921, stemming the tide of imports until the general tariff act of 1922 could be enacted. Just as in 1914, the undeclared wars throughout the world today have saved us from the full effects of the recent tariff reductions. However, the administration is paving the way for a recurrence of the flood of imports we had after the World War. Another emergency tariff will soon be in order.

Those branches of American agriculture which have not yet been affected by any of the existing trade treaties have cause for fear as to what may happen to them if treaties are negotiated with such countries as Australia, New Zealand, Mexico, Argentina, and other agricultural competitors. Officials of Australia were recently in Washington going over the possibilities of a treaty with this country. The precedent having been established for drastic reductions in farm tariffs under trade treaties, despite the President's promise in 1932 that such duties would not be reduced, we may expect the policy to be continued. It is significant that the British treaty contains a provision that if the duty on wool is reduced under any future treaty—possibly one with Australia, a large wool-producing country—compensatory benefits will be extended to the United Kingdom.

#### CANADIAN CONCESSIONS TO THE UNITED STATES

Concessions granted by Canada on American products follow the general line of the concessions under the old treaty. In addition, Canada undertakes to remove the special import tax of 3 percent applicable to a large volume of Canadian imports.

Duty reductions apply to articles exported to Canada in 1937 to a value of \$80,000,000, or approximately 27.6 percent of our dutiable exports to that country.

The new Canadian agreement continues to provide for most-favored-nation treatment of American exports, but the value of this provision is largely offset by the fact that the British Commonwealth of nations continue to get the so-called Empire preference in the Canadian market. What we actually receive in the way of most-favored-nation treatment is merely the benefit of treaty rates extended to non-British countries. This still leaves us at the same substantial disadvantage in trying to compete with the Empire countries for the Canadian market.

#### TREADWAY BILL TO LIMIT AMOUNT OF TARIFF REDUCTIONS AND REQUIRE CONGRESSIONAL APPROVAL OF TREATIES

Mr. Speaker, I would like now to call attention to a bill which I introduced on the first day of the session (H. R. 923) which I ask permission to insert in the RECORD at this point.



The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PATMAN). Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts? There was no objection.

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to read the bill to the House. It is as follows:

A bill to limit the President's authority in proclaiming modifications of existing tariff duties in connection with foreign-trade agreements, and to provide for the submission of such agreements to the Congress for approval

*Be it enacted, etc.,* That the President, in entering into foreign-trade agreements under the authority of section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and in proclaiming modifications of existing tariff duties pursuant thereto, shall in no event reduce the duties on articles the growth, produce, or manufacture of any foreign country below the amount necessary to equalize the differences in the costs of production (as defined in section 336 of such act) of such articles and like or similar domestic articles, if such domestic articles are produced in the United States in commercial quantities.

Sec. 2. Any foreign-trade agreement entered into by the President after the enactment of this act, and any renewal or extension of a previously existing foreign-trade agreement, shall not become effective until it shall have been approved by concurrent resolution of the Congress.

The purpose of the bill, as is obvious from its reading, is twofold: First, to prevent any reductions in our tariff rates below the amount necessary to offset the foreign cost-of-production advantage, and second, to require the approval of both Houses of Congress before the trade treaties shall become effective.

I might say that while I wholeheartedly favor the complete repeal of the President's authority under the Trade Agreements Act, as provided for in bills introduced by several of my colleagues, I realize that it is too much to hope for the passage of any measure for that purpose. It would meet with a certain veto at the hands of the President, and it is quite possible that he could muster sufficient votes in one House or the other to prevent passage over his veto. He also would unquestionably veto the measure I have presented should it or any similar measure be passed, but there is a very strong likelihood that this Congress would pass it over his veto if a vote could ever be had.

If any justification is needed for my bill, it is amply furnished by the British and Canadian treaties recently concluded. The administration has never hesitated to reduce tariffs under the treaties without reference to the difference in foreign and domestic production costs. While this has always, to my mind, been a serious objection to the treaty program, it becomes all the more so by reason of the increasingly large number of commodities affected. Moreover, the fact that these treaties so vitally affect the welfare of our people is a compelling reason, aside from constitutional considerations, why they should be approved by the Congress before becoming effective.

The Secretary of State has repeatedly said that his only concern was in reducing rates of duty that were excessive or unreasonable. Apparently he is satisfied in his own mind that the reductions he has made fall in that category, although he would find few people who would agree with him.

No one, I believe, can successfully challenge the statement that a rate of duty which does no more than equalize the competitive advantage of the foreign producer in the home market is not excessive or unreasonable, provided we produce the domestic article in commercial quantities at a cost not economically prohibitive. Such being the case there can be no reasonable objection to restricting the reductions in duty under the trade treaties in the manner provided by my bill. Such a limitation is imperative if we are going to protect the interests of American agriculture, industry, and labor, and maintain our American wage and living standards.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts and Mr. COCHRAN rose.  
Mr. TREADWAY. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. The gentleman does not believe these reciprocal-trade agreements are constitutional, does he?

Mr. TREADWAY. No; decidedly not. I was just about to deal with that phase of the question.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I hope the gentleman will cover that matter.

#### EXECUTIVE BRANCH EXERCISES LEGISLATIVE POWER IN FIXING TARIFF RATES UNDER TREATIES

Mr. TREADWAY. In securing the enactment of the law authorizing the trade-treaty program, the administration was careful to omit from the act any legislative rule or yardstick on which tariff concessions should be based. The executive branch of the Government has complete discretion in the matter, both as to the choice of articles on which concessions are to be made and as to the amount thereof within the 50-percent limitation. In effect, therefore, the President exercises legislative power contrary to the Constitution. The cost-of-production yardstick laid down under the so-called flexible tariff provisions of the 1930 tariff act, to which the Executive had to adhere in making tariff increases or decreases thereunder, is completely eliminated insofar as changes under the trade treaties are concerned. This legislative formula was the basis upon which the Supreme Court upheld the validity of the flexible tariff. The absence of such a legislative formula in the trade-treaty legislation makes the latter clearly invalid. However, no court test of its constitutionality can be obtained because the New Deal master minds craftily included a provision in the law taking away from American producers the right to appeal or protest, as formerly allowed them under section 516 (b) of the Tariff Act of 1930.

#### TREATIES NEGOTIATED IN SECRET

The trade treaties are, of course, negotiated in secret star-chamber proceedings, in which agents of this Government who are in no way responsible to the people or to Congress sit around the council table with foreign agents to decide what our citizens shall be allowed to produce in this country and what they must buy from abroad. Through their manipulation of our tariff rates they exercise what amounts to a power of life and death over every domestic industry, both agricultural and manufacturing, which is dependent upon tariff protection for its continued existence. They can regiment our workers in certain lines of activity and undermine their wage scale. While the President must take the ultimate responsibility for their actions, he cannot possibly be conversant with all the details, but must rely upon their recommendations. Even the Secretary of State, under whose general directions the negotiations are carried on, must do the same.

The Congress of the United States, which, under the Constitution, is supposed to have complete and exclusive authority over the tariff, is denied the power to review the terms of the treaties, no matter how disastrous may be their effect upon our home industries and our workers. The provisions of the treaties are not even made public until they have actually been concluded and the President has affixed his signature, thus making them binding and effective insofar as this country is concerned.

American interests have no opportunity to be heard on the terms of the treaties except before their negotiation is begun, and little heed is ever paid to their representations. They are relegated to much the same position as a convicted criminal who is asked by the judge whether he has anything to say before sentence is pronounced. In a way, they are in an even less favorable position, because the criminal at least has the right to appeal, which they do not.

#### MEMBERS OF CONGRESS HAVE LESS TO SAY ABOUT UNITED STATES TARIFFS THAN FOREIGN EMISSARIES

We Members of Congress have less to say about the tariff policy of this country than the foreign agents who take part in the treaty negotiations. They have a hand and voice in the negotiations. We have neither, nor do we even have any knowledge of what goes on behind the closed doors. This is a situation which should no longer be tolerated. While the Congress is moving toward the resumption of its legislative functions under the Constitution in other lines, it should also move toward the resumption of its legislative powers over the tariff.

It was argued at the time the trade-treaty legislation was before Congress for consideration that it was necessary for

the President to have a free hand in the treaty negotiations so that he could deal on a basis of equality with the heads of foreign governments, the representation being made that they had similar broad authority. However, it is noteworthy that with respect to the great majority of the trade treaties which have been negotiated, the foreign legislative bodies concerned have reserved the right to approve the treaties before they become finally effective. Why should not the Congress of the United States exercise the same right of review?

#### HOUSE SHOULD APPROVE TREATIES AS WELL AS SENATE

Some of those who are advocating congressional ratification of the treaties propose to limit such ratification to the body at the other end of the Capitol, on the theory, I suppose, that it has the exclusive constitutional right to do so. In my bill, however, I have provided for approval of the treaties by the House as well as by the Senate, because they directly affect the revenue, and this House has the exclusive power to originate revenue measures. I might point out that while the other body formally ratified the Cuban reciprocity treaty of 1902, the treaty did not become effective until enabling legislation, which originated in the House, had been passed, putting into effect the reductions in duty therein provided for. It is interesting to note, also, that the Collier trade-agreement bill which the Democratic majority of this House formulated and passed in 1932, during the last Republican administration, provided for House and Senate approval of the trade agreements authorized thereby. It will be remembered that the general trade treaties which the President was authorized to negotiate under the tariff acts of 1897 and 1913 also required House and Senate approval.

This House, in the interest of preserving its constitutional prerogatives, should never recognize that approval of the present trade treaties by the other body alone would be sufficient. They have that right so far as ordinary treaties are concerned, but a trade treaty which reduces rates of duty fixed by Congress is not an ordinary treaty.

Mr. COCHRAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri.

Mr. COCHRAN. Can the gentleman give the House any information at this time or will he place in the RECORD figures showing the value of exports from this country as well as the value of imports so that we will be able to see just how many million dollars the balance of trade is in favor of the United States?

Mr. TREADWAY. I may say to the gentleman I endeavored to secure and did secure the estimate of the cost of including in my remarks tables showing the difference between the rates in the trade treaty and existing law previous to the trade-treaty program, but the expense was so great that in the interest of economy I did not ask permission to insert that with my remarks.

Mr. COCHRAN. Cannot the gentleman place in the RECORD the balance in favor of the United States? That will only take a few figures.

Mr. TREADWAY. I shall be glad at some future time to go into that whole subject.

Mr. COCHRAN. How about putting it in his speech now?

Mr. TREADWAY. It is not part of these remarks.

Mr. COCHRAN. Those figures alone would show that the gentleman's argument is not sound.

Mr. TREADWAY. The gentleman is mistaken in that respect.

Mr. COCHRAN. Does the gentleman want to go back to the Smoot-Hawley Act?

Mr. TREADWAY. We have ample ways of amending the Smoot-Hawley Act that you gentlemen never availed yourselves of, and until you do so do not force any more of these trade treaties down our throats.

Mr. COCHRAN. We found a way to repeal it, which was much better.

Mr. TREADWAY. Why do you not put it into effect?

Mr. COCHRAN. We are putting it into effect.

Mr. TREADWAY. Why do you not come before Congress with your rates rather than go around the back door and behind locked doors telling foreign people they can make our rates and treaties? That is what you did. We will not stand for that at all.

Mr. REED of New York. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. REED of New York. It would be very interesting if the gentleman would include in his remarks the value of the pay rolls of the United States which have been the principal export of this country during the trade-agreement program.

Mr. TREADWAY. I believe that is a very good suggestion, although I have not the figures at this time.

The gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. CASE] tells me that the figures he would like to see put in the RECORD are those which would show the extent to which these so-called trade treaties have traded off the prosperity of our own producers. He feels, as I do, that we should be more concerned with the purchasing power of our own people than those in foreign countries, inasmuch as domestic trade is also a two-way street.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TREADWAY. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. KNUTSON. Carrying a little further the thought of the gentleman from Missouri, when the gentleman from Massachusetts gets around to putting in the RECORD the figures of exports and imports he might divide the subject of exports and separate from the other items the amounts of old iron we have been shipping to Japan and which is being used to kill the Chinese. This is one of the big items of export. [Applause.]

Mr. TREADWAY. Following up the idea of the gentleman from Minnesota, it will be found that the chief item of export from this country today is war materials.

Mr. KNUTSON. Why, certainly. It is 52 percent.

#### TRADE-TREATY PROGRAM A CERTAIN MAJOR ISSUE IN 1940

Mr. TREADWAY. Mr. Speaker, I want to say that in my opinion the ruinous trade-treaty program of the present administration will be one of the principal issues in the next election. The newspapers of the country have been flooded with the one-sided and frequently misleading propaganda of the State Department purporting to show the alleged benefits thereunder, but nothing is ever said about the increase in imports as a result of the treaties or the great cost at which small increases in exports to individual countries are obtained.

It seems to me that in the public interest some of the facts on the other side should be brought out. It is the duty and responsibility of the minority party to bring these facts to the attention of the people, and I, as one minority Member, expect to do my share in endeavoring to awaken the country to a realization of what is actually going on under the trade-treaty program.

It should, of course, be understood that the treaty program is strictly a New Deal proposition. It was vigorously opposed by the Republican minority in both branches when it was enacted in 1934. At the time it was extended for another 3 years in 1937, we again opposed it with all our vigor, and we shall continue to oppose it as long as the present destructive methods are continued.

The issues between the two parties over the tariff are clear: The New Deal administration favors the importation of foreign goods that compete with and displace the products of American agriculture, industry, and labor. The Republican Party favors a reciprocity policy which goes hand in hand with protection for our own people, under which adequate duties will be maintained on competitive foreign imports, and our surplus products will be exchanged for foreign products we need but do not produce ourselves.

The doubling of the representation of the Republican Party in the present Congress shows that the people are beginning to realize what the New Deal is doing to them. In the next Congress we are going to have more than enough Republicans to wipe out the present trade-treaty program, which is so detrimental to the interests of our people, and restore the



Republican policy of protection under which our country prospered for a century and a half.

#### INCREASED EXPORTS NOT DUE TO TREATY PROGRAM

Mr. Speaker, under permission granted to extend my remarks, let me refer to the results of the operation of the trade-treaty program. Statistics for the full year 1938 are not yet available. However, we may compare our foreign trade in the calendar year 1937 with the calendar year 1935, the first year in which the trade-treaty program began to be effective.

One of the chief points stressed by the State Department propaganda has been that our exports to treaty countries increased by 60 percent, whereas our exports to nontreaty countries increased by only 39 percent, from 1935 to 1937. On the surface, this makes it look like the treaty program has been an important factor in increasing our export trade. However, if the trade is analyzed on a regional basis it will be seen that the figures prove nothing. For example, exports to Europe show a greater increase to agreement countries—59 percent as compared with 22 percent in the case of nontreaty countries.

But just the reverse is true in the case of South America. There exports to nonagreement countries increased by 93 percent as compared with only a 65-percent increase in our exports to countries with which we have treaties.

Analyzing our European trade more closely, we find that while exports to Switzerland, a treaty country, increased by only 26 percent, exports to Norway, a nontreaty country, increased by 63 percent. Likewise exports to France, a treaty country, increased by 40 percent, while exports to Czechoslovakia, at that time a nontreaty country, increased by 306 percent. Even our exports to Germany, a nontreaty country and a nonbeneficiary of the generalization of our tariff reductions, increased by 35 percent.

All of which proves that the increase in our export trade cannot necessarily be credited, even in the case of treaty countries, to the treaty program. Indeed, it will be found that the bulk of the increase in exports to several of the treaty countries is in articles on which we were not granted concessions in duty. For example, in the case of Sweden, out of a total increase in our exports to that country from 1935 to 1937 amounting to \$26,000,000, commodities granted a reduction in duty accounted for less than \$400,000, or 1½ percent of the total.

#### IMPORTS HAVE INCREASED FASTER THAN EXPORTS

The fact that this country has been on the losing end of the trade-treaty program is clearly proven by the fact that since it has been in effect our imports have increased much faster than our exports. From 1934 to 1937 the increase in the physical quantity of our exports was less than 40 percent. On the other hand, the volume of our imports increased by 52 percent. But here is the significant fact: During this period the quantity of imports of dutiable items on which tariff concessions had been granted increased by 123 percent.

On the basis of dollar value, our imports increased by 93.4 percent from 1934 to 1937, while our exports increased by only 56.9 percent.

#### WAR MATERIALS ARE IMPORTANT PART OF INCREASED EXPORT TRADE

An analysis of our export trade shows that most of the increase in exports consisted of war materials and goods needed in connection with programs of national defense abroad. Of the total increase in exports from 1934 to 1937, only 25 percent of the value was represented by products of farms, forests, and fisheries.

In 1934, when the trade-treaty legislation was passed, we had a favorable balance of trade, or excess of exports over imports, amounting to \$478,000,000. In 1935, as a result of the more rapid increase in imports than in exports, our favorable balance dropped to \$235,000,000. The next year, 1936, it fell to only \$34,000,000. This downward trend continued until the middle of 1937, at which time we had an unfavorable balance of \$145,000,000. During the last half of 1937, however, the trend was reversed, due principally to an increase in our exports of war materials and supplies.

The value of our exports of these commodities rose from \$447,000,000 in 1936 to \$776,000,000 in 1937. This increase

in the exports of war supplies more than made up our favorable trade balance for 1937, showing that without these exports we would have had a heavy adverse balance in that year.

It is somewhat ironical that the trade-treaty program, which is supposedly dedicated to world peace, should by reason of an increase in our exports of war materials, be spared the responsibility of having brought about an unfavorable trade balance for the first time in half a century. Of course, the increase in these exports of war materials is not due to any concessions obtained under the treaty program, but the State Department proudly assumes full credit for the favorable trade balance.

Let me just call attention to a single item in the war materials group, scrap iron, of which Japan is the largest purchaser, having bought from us 1,900,000 gross tons in 1937. In the March 12, 1938, issue of Commerce Reports, published by the Department of Commerce, there is an article entitled "United States Leading Scrap Iron Exporter." This article refers to the fact that we exported in 1937 more than 4,000,000 tons, valued at \$80,000,000, as compared with exports of 773,000 tons in 1933, valued at only \$6,874,000.

#### FAVORABLE TRADE BALANCE FOR 1938 NOT DUE TO INCREASED EXPORTS

Trade figures for the full year of 1938 are not yet available, but when they are published they will undoubtedly show a large favorable trade balance for the past year. We may expect the State Department to come forward once more and attribute this fact to the trade-treaty program. However, if we analyze the trade for the first 9 months of 1938, as referred to in the November 5 issue of Commerce Reports, it will be found that this favorable trade balance cannot in any way be attributed to the treaty program. In the first place, through September 1938 our export trade had fallen off slightly, as compared with the same period in 1937, apparently indicating that foreign markets have not been opening up as expected. On the import side of the ledger we find that imports declined materially in 1938 over 1937. Again, this is not due to the trade-treaty program, since its policy and purpose is to increase, and not curtail, the importation of foreign goods. It is this decline in imports, coupled with the large exports of war materials, which enable us to have a favorable trade balance in 1938.

The Commerce Department gives us the reason for the decline in imports last year. In the publication to which I have just referred it says:

Import trade reflected the recession in business activity and the improvement in agricultural production in the United States.

The Department of Agriculture, in its publication *Foreign Crops and Markets*, for August 13, 1938, says, in referring to the decline in imports last year:

The decrease in business activity influences the value of practically all our imports, both agricultural and other. It was accompanied by lower prices and by a general falling off in demand. Raw materials were needed in smaller quantity by factories and finished products were purchased to a lesser extent by workers.

I commend this latter quotation to the Secretary of State and all others who attempt to defend the present trade-treaty program. The Secretary contends that it is the tariff which prevents foreign countries from trading with us. However, the fact is, as proven by both the Department of Agriculture and the Department of Commerce, that the amount of goods we buy from abroad depends directly upon the purchasing power of our people. If they are prosperous, they buy foreign goods, which are needed to supplement our own. If they are not prosperous, they reduce their purchases in proportion. That is plain. Our prosperity depends very little upon the foreign market. If more attention were given to improving the lot of our own people, foreign countries would have plenty of opportunity to sell us merchandise. Even under reduced tariffs our people will not buy foreign goods if they do not have the purchasing power.

The bumper farm crops of 1937 affected both the reduction in the imports of farm crops and the increase of farm exports. Imports were no longer needed to supplement our own curtailed production, while the grain surpluses available

for export, says the Department of Agriculture, "gave foreigners an opportunity to buy United States grain at competitive prices for the first time in more than 4 years." In passing, I might point out that there is an object lesson in this latter statement.

Trade-treaty proponents will doubtless claim that the increase in grain exports last year was due to the treaty program. The Department of Agriculture shows that there is no basis for that claim. Moreover, the fact is that few concessions have been obtained for American grain under trade treaties, and, in any event, most of the increase in exports had been to nontreaty countries. [Applause.]

#### EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to place in the RECORD at this point such figures as I can secure from the Department of Commerce with respect to exports and imports.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

#### SUMMARY OF FOREIGN TRADE OF THE UNITED STATES

Mr. COCHRAN. The following table shows the foreign trade of the United States as published by the Department of Commerce for the first 11 months of 1938 as compared with a similar period for 1937:

[Millions of dollars]

	11 months		Percent decrease
	1937	1938	
Exports.....	3,026	2,825	7
Imports.....	2,875	1,789	40
Total.....	151	1,036	
Agricultural:			
Exports.....	698	763	
Imports.....	1,483	877	

<sup>1</sup> Includes noncompetitive products such as coffee, tea, cocoa, bananas, silk, spices, and others not produced in the United States.

The above figures show that there was a slight decrease in total exports from the United States during the first 11 months of 1938 in comparison with a similar period of 1937, while exports of agricultural products increased by some \$65,000,000. On the other hand, the table shows that the imports of agricultural products, including noncompetitive articles not produced in the United States, decreased by more than one-half billion dollars for the comparative periods.

The question frequently arises as to the effects of trade agreements on our foreign trade. The latest study by the Department of Commerce shows the effects of the agreements for the year 1937-38 in comparison with nonagreement years, as follows:

[Millions of dollars]

	Comparison of last 12-month period, ending June 1938, with preagreement period calendar years 1934 and 1935			
	1934 and 1935 (annual average)	Fiscal year 1937-38	Change	
			Value	Percent
UNITED STATES EXPORTS, INCLUDING REEXPORTS				
Total, all trade agreement countries.....	756.8	1,257.7	+500.9	+66.2
Total, all nonagreement countries.....	1,451.0	2,143.4	+692.4	+47.7
Total, all countries.....	2,027.8	3,401.1	+1,192.3	+54.0
UNITED STATES GENERAL IMPORTS				
Total, all trade agreement countries.....	774.4	977.6	+203.2	+26.2
Total, all nonagreement countries.....	1,077.9	1,383.7	+306.7	+28.5
Total, all countries.....	1,851.4	2,361.3	+509.9	+27.6

The above data show that during the latest 12-month period, ending with June 1938, the relative increase in value of American exports, as compared with the 2-year preagreement period, 1934-35, was 66.2 percent to the agreement countries and 47.7 percent to the nonagreement countries. It is seen that there was only a slight difference between the relative increase of imports from agreement and nonagreement countries.

The Department of Agriculture has broken down the figures by farm products as follows:

[Millions of dollars]

United States (domestic) exports	Year ending June 30, 1938	Increase (+) or decrease (-)	
		1937-38 over 1935-36	
Farm products:			Percent
To the 16 agreement countries.....	288	+102	+55
To all other countries.....	600	+20	+3

This table shows that exports of United States farm products to the 16 countries rose by \$102,000,000, or by 55 percent from the fiscal year 1935-36—when only three of the agreements were in effect throughout the year—to the fiscal year 1937-38, the latest year for which data are available. Farm exports to all other countries rose only \$20,000,000, or by 3 percent, for the same period.

The imports of agricultural commodities from the trade-agreement and nonagreement countries for a similar period have been as follows:

[Millions of dollars]

United States imports (for consumption)	Year ending June 30, 1938	Increase (+) or decrease (-)	
		1937-38 over 1935-36	
Agricultural commodities:			Percent
From the 16 agreement countries.....	454	-14	-3
From all other countries.....	701	+27	+4

These figures should finally and definitely show that agriculture has not suffered through imports influenced by trade agreements.

#### PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that at the conclusion of the special orders for today I may be permitted to have 5 minutes to make a statement to the House.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from New Jersey [Mr. EATON] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. EATON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, as a humble taxpayer under the New Deal economy I was privileged by means of the radio to gather a few crumbs of political and economic lore that fell from the rich abundance of the master's table at the Jackson Day feast on Saturday evening.

To one who has been denied participation in the blessings of the more abundant life it was reassuring and comforting beyond measure to realize that even after 6 years of the New Deal there were still left some thousand or more princes of privilege who could pay \$100 apiece for a meal.

I am sure that this exhibition of Spartan self-denial will greatly encourage the one-third of our people who still remain ill fed, ill clothed, and ill housed and who have been the object of such tender and expensive solicitude on the part of the New Deal.

The only fly in the rich ointment of the published menu of this Lucullan feast seemed to be the wine, which was of the sour vintage of 1929, before the sun of the New Deal had risen to bathe the Nation's vineyards in sweetness and light.



The speech of our versatile and always unpredictable President was unique in several particulars. It was a well-balanced speech garnished with an equal combination of war clubs and olive branches. It might be fairly described as an ambidextrous speech, for in it with one hand he buried the hatchet of political strife, while with the other he immediately dug it up.

In one particular the President's Jackson Day address to the faithful and the faithless alike was unique beyond any public utterance of any Chief Executive in our entire history. It was based upon a personal radio contact and conversation which, in the quiet of an evening hour, the President had had with the dead.

Parenthetically—to use the President's phrase in which he served notice that there might be a new party in 1940—it would have been of immense theological interest if during this conversation Mr. Roosevelt had thought to ascertain exactly where the late President Jackson is now located and in what form of labor he is now engaged.

I am glad that our President has been able to make this supernatural contact with one whom he so greatly admires and with whose political policies, methods, and achievements he is in such complete accord and has so closely copied. The striking similarity in objectives and achievements between these two Chief Executives is outlined in the closing paragraph of the Encyclopedia Britannica's biography of Andrew Jackson. I quote:

Jackson is perhaps the only President of whom it may be said that he went out of office far more popular than he was when he entered. When he went into office he had no political opinions, only some popular notions.

Now, listen to this: Here is where Jackson and Roosevelt join hands and march like two lovers along the lane of human progress.

He—

Jackson—

left his party strong, perfectly organized, and enthusiastic on a platform of low expenditures, payment of the debt, no expenditure for public improvement, or for glory or display in any form, and—

Mirabile dictu—

low taxes.

Now that we are communing with Mr. Jackson without the use of the radio, I may be permitted to read another sentence or two from one whom, although I dwell in the Stygian darkness of Republicanism, I consider one of the great Americans of our history.

Mr. Jackson, in a letter under date of July 4, 1824, makes this statement. I am reading this to show how intensely loyal the New Deal has been to the Jacksonian method and principles:

If a national debt—

States Mr. Jackson—

is considered a national blessing, then we, like Great Britain, can get on by borrowing. But as I believe it a national curse, my vow shall be to pay the national debt, to prevent a moneyed aristocracy from growing up around our administration—

Parenthetically, that suggests that within the New Deal itself there may even be some of these princes of privilege, these economic royalists, sneaking right up on the President here and now if he does not watch out—

to prevent a moneyed aristocracy from growing up around our administration that must bend it to its views, and ultimately destroy the liberty of our country.

Again Mr. Jackson writes:

The management of the public revenue—that searching operation in all governments—is among the most delicate and important trusts in ours, and it will, of course, demand no inconsiderable share of my official solicitude. Under every aspect in which it can be considered it would appear that advantage must result from the observance of a strict and faithful economy.

The Members of the House must be startled as I go on reading by the close resemblance between Mr. Jackson's ideas and the ideas of the present incumbent of the White House.

LXXXIV—12

This I shall aim at the more anxiously, both because it will facilitate the extinguishment of the national debt, the unnecessary duration of which is incompatible with real independence, and because it will counteract that tendency to public and private profligacy which a profuse expenditure of money by the Government is but too apt to engender.

This is the Seventy-sixth Congress of the United States. It is composed of a high-minded class of representatives of character and ability. I have never been able to associate myself with the view so widely disseminated nowadays that the Congress of the United States is composed of accidents and weaklings. I have been associated all my life with able and devoted groups of men and women in religion, in politics, in business, and in education, and I say here that in a long career of 50 years I have never had the privilege of being associated with a group of men and women of higher moral and mental caliber and character, taken as a whole, than the Members of the Congress of the United States. And this is equally true on both sides of the aisle. So, when Andrew Jackson calls our attention to the dangers inherent in public debt, I lay it heavily upon the conscience and intelligence of the new Members and the old Members of this House to face our present chaotic and menacing debt situation with courage and competence.

Mr. Jackson continues:

Powerful auxiliaries to the attainment of this desirable end are to be found in the regulations provided by the wisdom of Congress for the specific appropriation of public money and the prompt accountability of public officers.

In other words, Andrew Jackson's message to this Congress is that when the leader of the New Deal came here the other day and laid on our doorstep the mangled remains of the fiscal policy of his administration and said, in effect, though not using the words, "Here is your baby; take care of it," it is up to every one of us to discharge our constitutional obligations, assume our individual responsibility, and see if, by united and intelligent action, we cannot at least begin to lift this Nation out of the abyss into which it has fallen.

In the brief time allotted I can only touch upon a few of the points made by the President in his historic Jackson Day address. In general, I gather that he is much perturbed by the voters' rejection of the New Deal in the election of November 8 on the ground that their adverse verdict indicates the return of the Republican Party to power in 1940. I gather further that the President disapproves of the Republican Party as a whole, which is somewhat surprising, and further, which is even more surprising, he disapproves of that important element in the Democratic Party which still bases its political faith upon the fundamental principles of American life and government as set forth in the Constitution.

Mr. Speaker, would you be good enough to quell these New Deal disturbances over here?

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. PATMAN). The Chair calls the House to order on both sides of the Chamber and the Sergeant at Arms will please help maintain order.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. EATON of New Jersey. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. It is really surprising what noise rubber stamps can make at times.

Mr. EATON of New Jersey. Since the iron of discovery and defeat has entered into the soul of the rubber stamps, they naturally make a little more noise than usual.

These two great steadying sections of our citizens, the Republicans and real Democrats, Mr. Roosevelt classifies as "tweedledums" and "tweedledees." But I cannot agree with him in locating all the "dum" tweedles in the Democratic Party. Evidently he fears that there may be enough of these two species of "tweedles" in 1940 to defeat the New Deal.

The President attributes the success of the Democratic Party in 1932, first, to the excessive fat of the Republicans, and, second, to the fact that the Democratic Party during that summer and autumn had a program of action and sounded sincere.

I generally agree with his analysis of the 1932 turn-over, but the President seems to be oblivious to the fact that the

turn-over in November 1938 was due to the fact that the people have lost their faith in the sincerity of the promises of the New Deal, which Mr. Roosevelt and his unofficial advisers have managed to substitute for the real Democratic Party. Let us examine for a moment a few of these New Deal promises made by the President himself and see if we can determine just why they no longer sound sincere. Mr. Roosevelt has said:

Campaign promises are supposed to be the responsibility of the whole party. At least that is the theory. But in practice the head of the party alone is held responsible for them.

Now, to just what campaign promises did Mr. Roosevelt in this statement refer? Was it his promise that "the cost of government will be reduced at least 25 percent?"

Or was it his promise to balance the Budget; and if so, which of his several promises?

Or his promise that a lot of "useless commissions, bureaus, and functions" in government shall be abolished?

Or his promise to "get more more service from the Department of Agriculture for less money"?

Or his promise that taxes were too high and must be reduced?

Or his promise that there must be no taxes on food and clothing, whose burden is actually shifted to the consumer?

Or his promise to reduce the Federal deficit; and if so, which of his several promises?

Or his promise that "we must stop borrowing to meet these continuing deficits"?

Or his promise that there must be no "doctrine of regulation and legislation by master minds \* \* \*?"

Or his promise that there must not be brought about "a government by oligarchy masquerading as democracy," under which "it is fundamentally essential that all authority and control be centralized in our National Government"?

Or his promise to "halt this steady process of building commissions and regulatory bodies and special legislation like huge inverted pyramids over every one of the simple constitutional provisions"?

Or his promise that "this 'home rule' is a most important thing, a most vital thing, if we were to continue along the course on which we have so far progressed with unprecedented success"?

Or his promise that "every new or old problem of government must be solved, if it is to be solved to the satisfaction of the people of the whole country, by each State in its own way"?

Or his promise that "the first and foremost" provisions of the Constitution must be enforced, that "every citizen is entitled to live his own life in his own way so long as his conduct does not injure any of his fellow men"?

Or his promise that "Washington must not be encouraged to interfere in the conduct of public utilities, of banks, of insurance, of business, of agriculture, of education, of social welfare, and of a dozen other important features"?

Or his promise that there should be "no interference by the Government in business"?

Or his promise that his administration would "cooperate" with business in a "spirit of helpfulness" instead of treating it with "hostility"?

Or his promise that "the Government should assume the function of economic regulation only as a last resort"?

Or his promise that there "must be no governmental control of prices"?

Or his promise that prices were too low and must go up?

Or his promise that prices were too high and must come down?

Or his promise that prices were both too low and too high and must go up and come down at the same time? [Laughter.]

Or his promise that "we condemn the unsound policy of restricting agricultural products to the demands of the domestic market"?

Or his promise that "there must be no coercion in the farm plan"?

Or his promise that, to quote his own words, "I dislike regimentation, not only when it is carried on by an informal group amounting to an economic government of the United States, but when it is done by the Government of the United States itself"?

Or his promise that the Government should not become "a prying bureaucracy"?

Or his promise that the Government would not be taken off the gold standard?

Or his promise that the three coequal, coordinate, independent constitutional departments of Government should be kept that way?

Or his promise that "the Bill of Rights must always be upheld" and no citizen coerced through relief or otherwise to surrender his political independence?

Or his promise that relief must not be polluted with politics?

Or his promise of a fact-finding tariff commission "free from political interference"?

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield? Mr. EATON of New Jersey. I yield.

Mr. GIFFORD. I want to warn the gentleman that if you keep somebody in a hot chamber too long fatal results are often reported. This matter of New Deal promises is a pretty hot chamber. I think the gentleman ought to be careful. [Laughter.]

Mr. EATON of New Jersey. I am not surprised that the gentleman makes an appeal for mercy, but he must remember that all of these promises sounded sincere. Well, I am nearly through, although the glut of material makes it possible for me to continue almost indefinitely.

Now, to answer the gentleman's suggestion, since few or none of these 57 varieties of promises made by the President, as head of the New Deal, seem to have been fulfilled, is it surprising that the New Deal program of 1938 did not "sound as sincere" to the voters as did the constructive American program of the real Democratic Party in 1932?

One other statement in the President's address is of prophetic interest. He said:

The younger generation of Americans, by a very large majority, intend to keep on "going places" with the New Deal.

Whatever the intentions of the youth of the land may be as to their "going places with the New Deal," there is one place to which, because of the New Deal's fiscal policy of waste, extravagance, and debt, they and their children after them will have to keep going as long as they live, whether they wish it or not. That place is the tax collector's office. That is where we are all, of every age and condition, now "going places" with the New Deal.

Mr. WADSWORTH. Or the poorhouse.

Mr. EATON of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman has 7 minutes remaining.

Mr. EATON of New Jersey. Notwithstanding the President's unique privilege of taking "shooting" and "counting" lessons from a supernatural instructor; in spite of his glowing eloquence and his loyal following of devoted New Dealers who not only "sound sincere" but are sincere, I find myself impelled today to take my place along with that great and growing army of Democratic tweedledums and Republican tweedledees in opposition to the New Deal. In fact, I have been opposed to it ever since it turned its back upon the sound and constructive American platform of the Democratic Party in 1932.

It rests upon two unsound principles: First, that you can make a silk purse out of a sow's ear; and, second, that you can get more meat out of an egg than there is in it.

It is not Democratic. It is not Republican. It is an irrational concatenation of economic and political cacophonies. [Laughter.] It will pass like an abnormal convulsion of Nature, but it will leave behind it a grim harvest of loss and ruin which American-minded men and women will have to reap.



The reasoned opposition to the New Deal which found expression in the last election, of November 8, and which is growing stronger every day among all classes and sections has little or no interest in the current political cant about "liberalism" or "conservatism." It is against the New Deal for causes and reasons furnished by the New Deal itself. It admits the glamorous personal qualities of Mr. Roosevelt, the father and founder and permanent high priest of the New Deal. It admits the desirability of those excessively noble objectives in which the New Deal claims exclusive right.

The people of what used to be free America are going to blast the New Deal out of power in 1940 because the policies of the New Deal prevent the return of good times. They have made up their minds that it is not necessary for our country to keep on floundering in the bog holes of economic depression.

Their reasoning rests upon a rock foundation of economic fact. In the 11 years from 1919 to 1929, inclusive, the American people on their own private initiative invested in durable goods, permanent construction, and maintenance over \$210,000,000,000, or an average of \$19,000,000,000 a year. In the period of the great depression and during the 6 years of the New Deal this form of private long-term investment has shrunk to an average investment of around five or six billion a year. It is this long-term private investment for future spending and profit which is the chief factor in solving the problem of unemployment. This is the foundation stone of good times. And this supreme source of prosperity for all the people is being destroyed by the New Deal's policy of wasteful experimentations, punitive taxation, and continual intrusion into the private affairs and personal liberties of the people. Except where absolutely necessary, people are afraid to invest because of their fear of the future under the New Deal and its aftermath of uncertainty.

Here lies the key to real recovery. Here is the real problem with which we Members of the Seventy-sixth Congress, regardless of party labels or livery, must deal.

If we can succeed in reopening this fountain of employment and prosperity for all the people, we shall save America. If we fail, who dares predict the result? [Applause.]

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the special order of the House heretofore entered, the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] is recognized for 20 minutes.

#### DOMESTIC SUGAR INDUSTRY

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, as announced yesterday, what I desire to discuss at this particular moment is the domestic sugar industry; meaning by that, those producers of sugar operating under the American flag located in Puerto Rico, in the Virgin Islands, domestic cane in Louisiana and Florida, domestic beet in the Northern and Northwestern States, cane in the Philippine Islands, and cane sugar in the Hawaiian Islands; and the relationship of the domestic industry to the current so-called reciprocal-trade agreement with Cuba and what I like to term the "subsidized agreement" with the Cuban Republic.

In 1934 President Roosevelt signed a bill under date of May 9, known as the Jones-Costigan Sugar Act, an amendment to the Agricultural Adjustment Act. Section 8a (1) of that act reads:

Having due regard to the welfare of domestic producers and to the protection of domestic consumers and to a just relation between the prices received by domestic producers and the prices paid by domestic consumers, the Secretary of Agriculture may, in order to effectuate the declared policy of this act, from time to time by orders or regulations, "establish market quotas."

These last three words are not in the bill except in a very expanded form.

Under date of September 1, 1937, the President signed another sugar bill, which provides:

That in the interest of international trade and for the purpose of protecting the domestic sugar industry and provide sugar to our people at a cost and at a price not in excess of that necessary to perpetuate the domestic sugar industry, the Secretary of Agriculture is authorized to establish marketing quotas.

The Secretary has proceeded under these acts to say to those engaged in the production of sugar in the continental United States and our offshore areas—Hawaii and the Philippine Islands, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands—that they may produce and ship in interstate commerce a designated amount of sugar for our people to consume. In establishing marketing quotas they have also extended those quotas to the sugar producers of Cuba—which is a foreign country, a republic—shipping sugar to United States market.

The marketing quotas established for the year 1939—expressed in short tons, raw value—which we are now entering into, gave to Cuba 1,953,759 tons to be sold to our people the coming 12 months; gave to the domestic beet-sugar industry 1,584,083 tons; to the cane people of Louisiana and Florida 429,434 tons; to the Hawaiian Islands 922,082 tons; to Puerto Rico 815,582 tons; and the Virgin Islands, 3,923; the Philippine Islands 991,020 tons; and to foreign lands the sum of 80,683 tons. These are the selling quotas established for the coming year by the Secretary of Agriculture under the authority given him by the present sugar act, signed September 1, 1937.

What has happened and what is happening from the standpoint of the treaty with Cuba, from the standpoint of the strain which is being put on the capital structures of the domestic sugar industry under the American flag as a result of this working out of the sugar plan, which has now been in operation a little more than 4 years? I want to acquaint you with a few of the facts brought down to date as quickly as I can in this short period. When the President presented to Congress a message early in 1937 looking forward to the enactment of the September 1, 1937, Sugar Act he dealt with a price structure on sugar in this country to the consumer; and I think every man and woman who watched the situation had reason to assume that the enactment of the 1937 act was not for the purpose of putting up the price of sugar to the consumer, but was for the purpose of protecting the consumer along with the domestic sugar industry. The preamble of the act reads as follows:

To regulate commerce among the several States, with the Territories and possessions of the United States, and with foreign countries; to protect the welfare of consumers of sugars and of those engaged in the domestic sugar-producing industry; to promote the export trade of the United States; to raise revenue; and for other purposes.

That was the purpose of the 1937 act. I think that is supposed to be the purpose, to a great extent, of this reciprocal trade agreement program which we have heard so much about—to promote trade and lift the standard of living of our people. I ask the new Members of Congress—and it does not hurt us older men to review our sugar history a little bit—to keep in mind where these areas are located, where our sugar bowls are. About twenty-two hundred miles off the coast of California is one—Hawaii. About 8,000 miles from San Francisco by boat lie the Philippine Islands. A short distance from Key West lies Cuba, and a little farther away lies Puerto Rico. In the continental United States we have the southern cane, the north and northwestern beet. These places I have mentioned are our sugar bowls.

Incidentally, the one time that we had to depend upon Cuba for our sugar supply for a period of 5 or 6 months, in 1920, the price of sugar went to \$35 per 100 pounds to the American consumer, because we were then dependent upon Cuba for our sugar supply; we were dependent upon a foreign country for our sugar supply. The exploitation by Cuba at that time of the pocketbooks of the American housewives was sufficient to pay, in that 6 months' period, for your domestic beet-sugar industry. We do not want that to happen again in time of peace or in time of war. We should, therefore, produce in this area—the continental United States of America—more than 26 percent of what we are now consuming.

We should produce more in peacetime and more in wartime than we do at the present time. But if you are to have even 26 percent of that sugar produced in this area, there will have to be some type of protection afforded the domestic

sugar industry, which was the intent of the Jones-Costigan Act of 1934 and the present sugar bill of 1937.

Let us get into some of the figures which the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] requested the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. TREADWAY] to submit. I anticipated somebody might ask this question. Let us look at the picture here.

Sugar control has been in operation 4 years. Incidentally, Cuba is a sugar bowl. For 4 years prior to the sugar-control situation Cuba's total sales to the world—all in round figures—amounted to \$451,000,000. For the 4 years under sugar control it amounted to \$576,000,000, an increase of \$125,000,000. Her total purchases from the world during the first 4 years were \$336,000,000; for the second 4 years under sugar control \$401,000,000, an increase of \$65,000,000. That is world trade. It shows an increase in Cuba's purchases of \$65,000,000.

Let us bring this down to the United States. During the 4 years prior to sugar control Cuba sold us \$320,000,000 worth of goods. Under sugar control she sold us \$455,000,000 worth of goods, an increase of \$135,000,000.

Now, I am going to show you what it cost to get that business. She purchased from the United States during the 4 years prior to control, which were those bad, lean years of 1932 and 1933—keep that in mind—\$188,000,000 worth of goods; under the 4 years of control \$252,000,000 worth of goods, an increase of \$64,000,000 under sugar control.

Let us consider the gross income from sugar for 4 years before and after the control program.

Cuba received a gross income from sugar during the 4 years prior to control in an amount of \$223,000,000. The domestic sugar industry received \$358,000,000.

Income under the 4 years of control: Cuba received \$370,000,000 while the domestic sugar industries received \$1,115,000,000. The increase to Cuba under control was 65.7 percent and to the domestic sugar industry only 30 percent. Keep those figures in mind. The loss of revenue—\$213,900,000—which the American taxpayers and the American housewife suffered in order to pick up that measly increase of \$65,700,000 in trade with Cuba is reflected in table 3.

When the present administration went into power there was a \$2 duty on sugar coming into this country from Cuba, or \$40 a ton. The first step taken by this administration was to reduce this duty from \$2 per hundred on 96 degree raw sugar down to \$1.50 per hundred pounds. That was a \$10 per ton loss in duty. The revenue loss during that short period amounted to \$1,659,000. Then we reduced the duty—and when I say "we" I mean Congress, the present administration leading—on sugar coming in from Cuba from \$1.50 per hundred to 90 cents per hundred. That was an additional \$12 per ton cut in duty. Under the quota system, mind you, Cuba would have shipped as much sugar into this country under the \$2 duty as she will ship under the 90-cent duty or the \$1.50 duty, or the proposed 75-cent duty. Keep that in mind. She cannot resist our market. That is a subsidy we are paying to Cuba and that is the reason I term this a "subsidy agreement." So altogether, to hurry on, we have paid a premium to Cuba of \$213,900,000 in order to pick up an increase in trade of \$65,700,000.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Will the gentleman tell the Members of the House if the laboring men of Cuban producers of sugar got the benefit of this magnificent subsidy; and if they did not, who actually got it and who actually owns the sugar plantations and the sugar business in Cuba?

Mr. CRAWFORD. The laboring people of Cuba have not received these benefits. Here is the proof of that statement: Any man who travels in Cuba and studies the economic conditions and standards of living gets proof of that fact. Any man who checks the stock ownership as best he can of the plantations and mills in Cuba knows it is an "absentee ownership," and as the earnings are made they flow out of Cuba to certain consolidated interests, located mostly in the United

States, tied in very closely with the National City Bank, the Chase National Bank, the Royal Bank of Canada, the National Shawmut Bank, Hayden, Stone & Co., and a few lesser lights.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. If you will break down these export of goods from the United States, you will find that that type of goods which the worker in Cuba uses has not increased in a manner which reflects that the worker in Cuba, the common herd, received these increased benefits of \$213,900,000. Keep this in mind: As you reduce the duty on sugar coming into this country from Cuba you increase the amount of net earnings to the Cuban companies and fortify their capital structure. They take advantage of the decrease in duty, and the benefit flows to the Cuban industries. Of course, the State Department, in my opinion, desired to do that when it promoted the enactment of these bills. I am not objecting to that particular phase of the situation primarily provided the situation is handled in a way that it does not destroy the domestic sugar industry in Puerto Rico, Hawaii, the Philippine Islands, the United States cane- and beet-sugar industries; permits our people to have sugar at a reasonable price and all at the same time lets the domestic industry expand as it desires to do so.

I now yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. In view of the President's indication of potential wars brewing, does the gentleman not think it would be well to expand the American sugar industry and raise the tariff on Cuban sugar as a matter of national defense?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Directly answering that question, I cannot imagine, I cannot comprehend the situation which has developed during the last few days wherein the dictator of Cuba, Colonel Batista, visited our State Department and our Capitol, as published under date of November 29 in the New York Times, a photostatic copy of which I have here, and then returned to Cuba and made an announcement to the effect that he had reached an agreement. Who had reached an agreement? The little dictator from Cuba had reached an agreement with the State Department under which the duty on Cuban sugar is to be further reduced through the reciprocal trade agreement set-up from 90 cents per 100 to 75 cents per hundred. I believe that almost borders on scandal, myself.

[Here the gavel fell.]

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Michigan may be extended 10 minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAPES. Will the gentleman yield to me for a question?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Will the gentleman from Michigan let me finish my answer to the question of the gentleman from Wisconsin? Then I shall be pleased to yield.

As a result of that situation, which borders on scandal, and which in my opinion is teetotally in rank violation of the provisions of the reciprocal trade agreement acts, a Member of the body at the other end of this Capitol only yesterday afternoon, in defense of his party and the procedure of the administration, was forced to introduce a resolution which has been referred to the Senate Committee on Finance calling for an investigation to find out on what basis the little dictator from Cuba can come up here and obtain such assurance before hearings are held on an extension of or an amendment to the reciprocal-trade agreement with Cuba.

Furthermore, at the present time, with the President putting such stress on the evidence of war and the necessity of fortifying our people against invasions of the dictatorships, why in the name of our people do we add dignity in such a manner as we have during the past few weeks to the dictatorial powers which have been maintained over the people of the Republic of Cuba? With all the scare of war which is gripping this country, why in the world should we move in a direction that makes our consumers of sugar almost teetotally



dependent upon the island of Cuba for our sugar supply if there is to be war?

I now yield to the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES].

Mr. MAPES. In connection with the alleged agreement that the dictator of Cuba states he has made with the State Department, to lower the tariff rate from ninety to seventy-five cents a hundred, will the gentleman elaborate a little on the statement he made earlier in his remarks that it does not matter what the tariff rate may be, the same amount of sugar is shipped into the United States from Cuba regardless of the tariff duty?

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is one of the tricks in this whole proposition. Keep this in mind. Let me repeat just for a moment that the United States sugar market is allocated to certain producing areas by the Secretary of Agriculture, and, those allocations having been made, Cuba can ship to our people a definite quantity of sugar irrespective of what the world supply may be or what our needs may be, Cuba can ship her quota. Hawaii can ship a certain proportion, as can Puerto Rico and the Virgin Islands. Although our farmers in the South and the West and the North produce more than their quota amounts to, they cannot move it into interstate commerce. These burdensome supplies hang over the shoulders of the farm producers and factory operators and all sugar owners and bear down and put a strain on their capital structures, which will begin to break in the coming months as present prices and even lower ones are realized against the stocks now on hand. It will be then the whole story will be told. The losses are not yet recorded on the balance sheets of the companies involved. We face a repetition of what happened in 1932 unless we change the course in which we are now traveling.

We learn from reports issued by the commodity houses in New York that during the year just closed and at this particular hour refined sugar is selling on the lowest basis in all history.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. MAPES. The Cuban allotment is shipped here, regardless of whether the duty is 75 cents a hundred or \$2 a hundred.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The gentleman is correct. That is exactly the situation.

Keep this in mind: The island of Cuba enjoys a 40-percent preferential over other foreign countries. The full duty, for instance, is \$1.87½ a hundred. Cuba is shipping sugar here on a 90 cents per hundred duty basis. Cuba should take advantage of her preferential. That would be a most constructive step for all, and by not doing so Cuba "bears" down the market price to the detriment of the whole industry. Why should the preferential be continued unless Cuba takes advantage of her gain? With the preferential, Cuba can hold the American market against other foreign shippers, and that is why she has been granted the preferential.

They—Cubans—have another advantage there, and let me point this out for just a moment.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. COFFEE of Nebraska. I believe the gentleman from Michigan has been making a very good analysis of the situation. I wonder if the gentleman knows that the Department of the Interior has just recently protested the reduction contemplated in the proposed new trade agreement with Cuba? I believe the friends of sugar should do likewise.

Mr. CRAWFORD. The Department of the Interior, which has charge, you might say, of the economic welfare of the people located in the Hawaiian, Puerto Rican, and the Virgin Islands, appeared before the Committee on Reciprocity Information within this last week and made one of the most scathing attacks on this proposal to reduce further the duty on sugar coming from Cuba which has ever been made in sugar history, insofar as I have been able to ascertain. Of course, the Department of the Interior must speak in behalf of the islanders.

Let me ask this question: Why was not the Department of Agriculture of the United States of America up there before that Committee on Reciprocity Information asking that this industry be protected for the benefit of the people who live on the farms of the United States?

Mr. REED of New York. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes.

Mr. REED of New York. I am very much interested in the splendid statement the gentleman is making with regard to the sugar situation. I think that he could enlighten me and the Members of this House on one question which has always puzzled me. I understand that we have literally millions of acres of land suitable to the raising of sugar beets. If that be true, why is it that these markets are given to these foreign countries rather than to developing the sugar industry here with the idea of being self-sufficient at home?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Let me answer that question by reference to a map. Take the large map of the United States and starting down here around New Mexico, move north-easterly, north of St. Louis, through Indianapolis to Wheeling, W. Va., and north to the Atlantic seaboard, and one may say that nearly all of that tillable land, including the Panhandle of Texas, the north and south plains, is ideal sugar-growing territory, insofar as beet sugar is concerned. And if you will give Louisiana its proper part, it will produce 1,000,000 tons of sugar per annum in due course, and Florida will produce 500,000 tons.

Mr. REED of New York. I was just going to ask that question. We have available how many acres, would the gentleman say?

Mr. CRAWFORD. We could produce every pound of sugar needed here, which means one bag of sugar for every person in the United States per annum if we willed to do so, and we could do it on a profitable basis.

Mr. KNUTSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes.

Mr. KNUTSON. The question asked by the distinguished gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] recalls the fact that the Cuban sugar interests are owned by the big New York banks, and it may be possible that they have more influence here in Washington than many of us suspect.

Mr. CRAWFORD. That is an observation which I support, with 20 years of study of this proposition.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman from New York [Mr. REED] asked if the gentleman knows of any reason why we were not producing our sugar at home, and why the discrimination in favor of offshore producers? I ask the gentleman whether he recalls being in the office of the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. MAPES], and a Michigan delegation, when two representatives came up from the Department of Agriculture and in answer to that very question stated that the reason they proposed to give this market to the offshore area is because that area can produce it more cheaply, and that it is not profitable to grow sugar in the United States?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Oh, they even held that it is uneconomical to produce sugar in Michigan, in Indiana, and Ohio, where it is already being produced on a profitable basis, if given at all a reasonable price for the refined product.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Michigan has expired.

Mr. MAPES. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman be extended for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is not inclined to put that request without the consent of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS], who has been assigned time.

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I have no objection.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, the Department of Agriculture said it is uneconomical to produce sugar in the area of Michigan, Ohio, Wisconsin, Indiana, although sugar can be produced in that area on a profitable basis to the hand laborer, to the farmer, to the mill owners, and sold to the grocery trade at not to exceed 4½ cents per pound net. Yet the Department holds that it cannot be produced on an economical basis. It is one of the most unusual positions, I think, that has ever been taken by any Department of Agriculture, and my contention is that this Cuban experiment, in order to expand world trade, is the costliest experiment of its kind ever carried on in the history of the world.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes.

Mr. SCHAFER of Wisconsin. In order to clear up some of the reasons why the American sugar interests are sacrificed, and the Cuban sugar interests taken care of, it might be interesting to know that Moody's Industrials indicates that Vincent Astor, the owner of the yacht on which the President has traveled on many occasions, is one of the heaviest stockholders of the United Fruit & Sugar Co. and the owner of Guantanamo lands and mills, and it is further interesting that the hearings of the Senate will show that 2 days before he assumed a Cabinet position Mr. Daniel C. Roper was the paid lobbyist for the Cuban sugar interests and certain American banks holding Cuban sugar property.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CRAWFORD. Yes.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. Some years ago a very interesting speech was made by our colleague from Iowa [Mr. COLE] pointing out the future of corn sugar and of the Jerusalem artichoke. I am anxious to know what progress has been made in that direction?

Mr. CRAWFORD. If we would go into the production of the Jerusalem artichokes—and I think that process is being kept submerged like some patents are—we would have a more digestible sweet which would replace sugar, in my opinion, and at a less cost per 100 pounds than we have at the present time, and we could grow then almost unlimited production.

Mr. ROBSION of Kentucky. He pointed out that the Jerusalem artichoke had a richer sugar content than even our cane sugar, and could be produced successfully on every acre of tillable soil in this country.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Now, let me make this point and then I want to yield to the gentleman from New York [Mr. MARC-ANTONIO]. While this increase I was showing by my figures awhile ago was taking place, bear in mind that the whole world was on the upgrade insofar as international trade was concerned. In other words, if you will take the sugar-control plan, the effects of the multilateral, unilateral, and bilateral agreements and all these various things that enter into the question, if you will make a laboratory test of all that and get the figures and put them on the boiler plate, put them to a fair test, you can come to the conclusion—and my prediction is that you will come to the conclusion—that we are indeed the poorest, most inefficient, most incapable international horse traders in the ring today. [Applause.] I think it is time we began to take notice of it. [Applause.]

#### UNFAIR TO PUERTO RICO

Let us consider Puerto Rico for a moment with relation to this proposed further reduction of the Cuban duty from 90 cents per 100 pounds to only 75 cents per 100 pounds. It appears to me—and I feel sure the facts will support the assumption—that Puerto Rico will have to bear a most unreasonable and unjust burden. I refer you to the statement of the representative of the Department of the Interior before the Committee for Reciprocity Information. These are staggering facts we are here dealing with. To further reduce the duty when the price on refined sugar is so low and after Cuba has been treated so generously is to impose an unfair treatment to our own people. I protest against such action. I sincerely trust the Senate resolution will bring about an

arrest of this speedy action. The record shows that entirely too much was said by our State Department to the Cuban official, and it was said too quickly. This all indicates the vigilance we must exert when such vast powers are extended to departments and bureaus. If an error is made in judgment, great industries may be destroyed and whole groups of people, such as the Puerto Ricans, reduced to actual peonage. Such fast work breaks down the confidence of our people in the agencies of government, and that is indeed destructive. Let us have more light on these hearings and a better check on the powers of departments and bureaus.

#### PHILIPPINE ISLANDS HAVE A BIG STAKE IN THE AFFAIR

Mr. Speaker, let us look at the Filipinos' problem for a moment. Take the recent report of the Joint Committee on Philippine Affairs along with the Philippine Independence Act. Consider the staggering situation that will govern if the Cuban duty is reduced to 75 cents and the Filipinos find themselves paying \$1.875 per 100 pounds duty. The serious problem wrapped up in "Philippine uncertainty" is another reason why we should proceed more carefully in fortifying Cuba at this time.

If it is the aim of the administration to move directly toward free trade with Cuba or to have not to exceed, say, 25 cents per 100 pounds duty on Cuban sugar, this reduction now proposed to be given to Cuba further fortifies Cuba in being able to eliminate the entire domestic sugar industry and hold the market of the United States against producers in the Philippine Islands.

#### APPEAL TO MEMBERS OF CONGRESS

I appeal to every Member of Congress to make a thorough study of the problem of the domestic sugar industry in continental United States, in Hawaii, in Puerto Rico, the Virgin Islands, and all in connection with the reciprocal trade-agreement policy. In addition, let me urge you to carefully consider the Philippine report above referred to. In the meantime, urge the Department of State to defer action on further reducing the Cuban duty.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House the gentleman from Texas [Mr. SUMNERS] is recognized for 5 minutes.

#### ELECTION OF PRESIDENTIAL ELECTORS

Mr. SUMNERS of Texas. Mr. Speaker, I am taking these 5 minutes to call attention to a very interesting and important situation that obtains with reference to the election of President and Vice President. It would not be too strong a statement to say that under conditions which now obtain a President of the United States could be elected by fraud and nothing could be done about it. That is a statement that ought to startle us, but I have been making it now for 6 years, ever since the "lame duck" amendment was passed, and nobody has yet paid any attention to it. This condition arises out of the fact that whereas prior to the passage of the "lame duck" amendment, we inaugurated the President on the 4th of March we now inaugurate on the 20th of January, a month and a half earlier. Prior to the "lame duck" amendment there was not too much time between the time when the electors were elected and the time they met to cast their votes, to determine the question of fraud in the election. But when we moved the time for the inauguration of the President from the 4th of March back to the 20th of January, and left the other end of the arrangement as it had been when we were inaugurating the President the 4th of March we created an impossible situation. So we cut down the intervening time in which the question of fraud could be discovered and something done about it, by about 54 days.

So we have a situation now, as I remember it, where there are only 41 days between the time when the electors are elected and the time they meet to cast their votes.

Now, there is considerable uncertainty. The matter as to just who would have jurisdiction was examined a long time ago, about 1838, by a very distinguished group of men constituting a joint Senate and House committee. Henry Clay and men of that type made that investigation on behalf of the House and the Senate, and they reported to their respective



bodies that there was a great deal of uncertainty about that. But there is no uncertainty about the fact that the electors are State officers. The Constitution provides that the States shall make the appointments. The Congress has the power to determine when they are to be elected and when they are to meet to cast their vote. There is not a single State in the Union that can gear up its judicial machinery fast enough to try the issue of fraud in 41 days. The Houses of Congress might act; I have not examined as to their power; but even if they possess it, its exercise would be dangerous for many obvious reasons.

Now, it has been suggested, and there are a great many difficulties about getting more time between the election of the electors and the casting of their vote, and that we should do away with the electoral college, but that would require a constitutional amendment. Having shortened the intervening time, as I have indicated, I see nothing that can be done about it except to move back the time when the election of the electors is to be held. The necessity to do that was fixed when the "lame duck" amendment moved up the inauguration of the President and Vice President from March to January. Before that amendment was adopted we had two controlling fixed points of time, Tuesday after the first Monday in November, when the electors were elected, and March 4, when the President and Vice President chosen by the electors were inaugurated. I drew the bill which changed the method of bringing up the returns from the old method of bringing them up by messenger to the existing method of bringing those returns up by registered mail. It was more or less an experiment. Well, I can hardly say that, but there were some experimental features about it.

I was very careful in drawing that bill fully to protect the record of the determination of the electors. I believe that law can be redrafted preserving the safeguards, and we can gain about a week by revamping that bill. That would give about 48 days. Then if we could move back the time of the general election from the first Tuesday in November to the first Tuesday in October, that would give us 30 days more. It would give us enough time to have a fair chance to determine the issue of fraud.

I have introduced this bill each Congress since the passage of the "lame duck" amendment. I have endeavored to call the attention of my colleagues and the country to the gravity of the situation. I am simply repeating what I have been doing for the last 6 years. The matter does not come within the jurisdiction of the Committee on the Judiciary. It is a matter within the jurisdiction of the Committee for the Election of President and Vice President, a committee that does not frequently meet. What I am saying is not in criticism of that committee particularly. I am not bragging on what it has done about it, however. Now, when we can do this thing in a deliberate way, we ought to do it; and we ought to do it very quickly, because a serious situation might develop. Possibly some other method could be worked out, but it is certain it is not going to work itself out. It requires no great imagination to visualize what might develop in a close election when feeling was running high with a belief that wholesale fraud had been perpetrated in one or more pivotal States with no possibility of a final judicial determination prior to the time for the inauguration of the President and Vice President. I do not go so far as to say that nothing could be done about it, but I do say that nothing calculated to preserve either confidence or harmony could be done. [Applause.]

[Here the gavel fell.]

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—REPORT OF PANAMA RAILROAD CO.

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, the Eighty-ninth Annual Report of the Board of Directors of

the Panama Railroad Co. for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1938.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 10, 1939.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES—REPORT OF THE CENTRAL STATISTICAL BOARD

The SPEAKER laid before the House the following message from the President of the United States, which was read, and, with the accompanying papers, referred to the Committee on Expenditures in the Executive Departments and ordered to be printed:

*To the Congress of the United States:*

I transmit herewith, for the information of the Congress, a report of the Central Statistical Board on the Returns Made by the Public to the Federal Government. I recommend that this report be printed as a public document.

FRANKLIN D. ROOSEVELT.

THE WHITE HOUSE, January 10, 1939.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. VOORHIS of California. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a letter from the director of public health of the State of California.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. BULWINKLE. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 1 o'clock and 57 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, January 11, 1939, at 12 o'clock noon.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, executive communications were taken from the Speaker's table and referred as follows:

193. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a list of papers consisting of 95 items from the War Department which the Department has recommended should be destroyed or otherwise disposed of; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

194. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a list of motion-picture films consisting of 16 items from the Department of the Interior which the Department has recommended should be destroyed or otherwise disposed of; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

195. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting lists of papers consisting of 383 items from those recommended to him for disposition by the Department of Agriculture; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

196. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a list of papers from the Veterans' Administration which the Administration has recommended be destroyed or otherwise disposed of; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

197. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a list of papers consisting of two items from the Smithsonian Institution which this agency has recommended be destroyed or otherwise disposed of; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

198. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a list of papers from the Tennessee Valley Authority consisting of seven items which the Authority has recommended be destroyed or otherwise disposed of; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

199. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a list of papers, consisting of 105 items, from the census on partial employment, unemployment, and occupations, which the agency has recommended be destroyed or otherwise disposed of; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

200. A letter from the Secretary of the Interior, transmitting the draft of a proposed bill to change the designations of

the Abraham Lincoln National Park, in the State of Kentucky, and the Fort McHenry National Park, in the State of Maryland; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

201. A letter from the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation, transmitting the report of the Federal Surplus Commodities Corporation for the fiscal year 1938; to the Committee on Agriculture.

202. A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting a report on one item, recommended to him for disposition, by the Department of State; to the Committee on the Disposition of Executive Papers.

203. A letter from the Attorney General, transmitting the draft of a proposed bill to amend an act entitled "An act making appropriations for the naval service for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1910, and for other purposes," approved March 3, 1909, as amended, so as to extend commissary privileges to civilian officers and employees at naval stations beyond the continental limits of the United States or in Alaska; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

204. A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting the draft of a proposed bill to permit the President to acquire and convert, as well as to construct, certain auxiliary vessels for the Navy; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

#### PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. WELCH:

H. R. 2167. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to lend War Department equipment for use at the Golden Gate International Exposition during the year 1939, to the California Grays; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 2168. A bill to authorize the Secretary of War to make contracts for the supplying of water to the Golden Gate Bridge and Highway District; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. KEOGH:

H. R. 2169. A bill granting holidays to postal employees in States where holidays are a State law; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

H. R. 2170. A bill granting annual and sick leave to postal employees; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

H. R. 2171. A bill to provide annuities for widows of employees and retired employees of the United States and the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. IZAC:

H. R. 2172. A bill to increase the number of midshipmen allowed at the United States Naval Academy appointed at large; to the Committee on Naval Affairs.

By Mr. CHANDLER:

H. R. 2173. A bill to provide for the appointment of one additional circuit judge for the sixth judicial circuit; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. PACE:

H. R. 2174. A bill to provide for the establishment and maintenance of a research laboratory or experiment station for the cultivation and fertilization of peanuts and other agricultural products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. WOLCOTT:

H. R. 2175. A bill for the better assurance of the protection of persons within the several States from mob violence and lynching, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2176. A bill to amend subsection 10 of section 4 of the act of June 29, 1906 (34 Stat. 596; U. S. C., title 8, sec. 377); to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DIMOND:

H. R. 2177. A bill to amend the Home Owners' Loan Act of 1933; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

H. R. 2178. A bill to amend sections 6 and 7 of the act entitled "An act for the retirement of employees of the Alaska

Railroad, Territory of Alaska, who are citizens of the United States," approved June 29, 1936; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. JONES of Texas:

H. R. 2179. A bill to ratify and confirm certain interest rates on loans made from the revolving fund authorized by section 6 of the Agricultural Marketing Act, approved June 15, 1929 (46 Stat. 11), and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. McREYNOLDS:

H. R. 2180. A bill to amend the Tennessee Valley Authority Act of 1933 by providing for the payment to certain counties of the State of Tennessee, in lieu of taxes, a percentage of the proceeds of power sales; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GOLDSBOROUGH:

H. R. 2181. A bill to provide a national monetary policy which will have a definite relationship to the requirements of domestic industry and trade under the conditions imposed by our power economy, which will increase production and consumption to the limit of the country's power to produce, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. GROSS:

H. R. 2182. A bill to exempt certain cigar makers from the wages and hours provisions of the Fair Labor Standards Act; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. BLAND:

H. R. 2183. A bill to authorize the Board of Engineers for Rivers and Harbors to prepare estimates and plans for improvement of certain river and harbor projects, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. ROBINSON of Utah:

H. R. 2184. A bill to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain property to Washington County, Utah, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. O'CONNOR:

H. R. 2185. A bill to authorize the addition to Glacier National Park, Mont., of certain property acquired for the establishment and operation of a fish hatchery, and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. PACE:

H. R. 2186. A bill to amend section 77 of the Judicial Code, as amended, to create a Fitzgerald division in the southern district of Georgia, with terms of court to be held at Fitzgerald, Ga., and for other purposes; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOEHNE:

H. R. 2187. A bill to permit full deduction for income-tax purposes of employees' trusts; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. HOBBS:

H. R. 2188. A bill to provide for the alteration of or changes to bridges over navigable waters of the United States, for the apportionment of the cost of such changes or alterations between the United States and the owner or owners of such bridges, to authorize the appropriation of funds for such purposes, and to repeal all inconsistent laws; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WOLCOTT:

H. R. 2189. A bill to provide for a preliminary examination and survey of the Clinton River in Michigan with a view to flood control and to determine the cost of such improvement; to the Committee on Flood Control.

By Mr. HILL:

H. R. 2190. A bill to regulate interstate and foreign commerce in agricultural products yielding exportable surpluses or traded in speculative markets; to prevent unfair competition by forbidding the purchase of such products from producers for less than cost of production; to provide for the orderly marketing of such products; to set up emergency reserve from certain export percentages, to provide for the general welfare, to regulate the value of money in farm products; and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.



By Mr. LEA:

H. R. 2191. A bill to provide for the regulation of the sale of certain securities in interstate and foreign commerce and through the mails, and the regulation of the trust indentures under which the same are issued, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BROOKS:

H. R. 2192. A bill to extend the time for commencing and completing bridges across Cross Bayou, Twelve Mile Bayou, and Caddo Lake in Caddo Parish, La.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SMITH of Washington:

H. R. 2193. A bill to authorize the reimbursement of the port of Vancouver, Wash., for dredging work done in the Columbia River covered by project set forth in Rivers and Harbors Committee Document No. 81, Seventy-fourth Congress, second session; to the Committee on Rivers and Harbors.

By Mr. SCRUGHAM:

H. R. 2194. A bill to provide for deferring the payment of construction charges falling due during the calendar year 1938 on the Newlands reclamation project in the State of Nevada; to the Committee on Irrigation and Reclamation.

H. R. 2195. A bill authorizing the Secretary of the Interior to convey certain land to the State of Nevada to be used for the purposes of a public park and recreational site and other public purposes; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. KEE:

H. R. 2196. A bill to impose taxes on fuel oil; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. KRAMER:

H. R. 2197. A bill granting travel pay and other allowances to certain soldiers of the Spanish-American War and the Philippine Insurrection who were discharged in the Philippines; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. HALL:

H. R. 2198. A bill to provide for the application of the 2-cent rate on first-class mail matter for delivery within the confines of any incorporated city and to contiguous cities; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. R. 2199. A bill to authorize the payment for certain timber products, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

H. R. 2200. A bill to dispense with particular allegations as to renunciation of allegiance in petitions for naturalization and in the oath of renunciation of foreign allegiance, by omitting the name of "the prince, potentate, state, or sovereignty" of which the petitioner for naturalization is a subject or citizen; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. DUNN:

H. R. 2201. A bill to authorize the Bureau of Investigation to investigate and assist in the prosecution of cases involving the killing or assaulting of officers of the United States Government; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2202. A bill to establish a minimum rate of pay for all employees of the Government of the United States and of the government of the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the Civil Service.

By Mr. HOBBS:

H. R. 2203. A bill to provide for the recording of the proceedings in one of the courtrooms of the District Court of the United States for the District of Columbia by sound-recording equipment, and for the reproduction of the sounds of such proceedings, in whole or in part, in the District of Columbia Circuit Court of Appeals and in the Supreme Court of the United States upon the review of any such case; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

H. R. 2204. A bill to limit the matter appearing in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD to the actual proceedings of the Congress and to prohibit the inclusion therein of extension of remarks; to the Committee on Printing.

H. R. 2205. A bill to repeal the act of May 24, 1928, and amendments thereof and supplements thereto; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

H. R. 2206. A bill to provide for loans to farmers to enable them to terrace or drain their lands; to the Committee on Agriculture.

H. R. 2207. A bill to permit all litigation in the courts of the United States without the requirements of deposits of money and to make it unlawful to require the printing of the record and other papers on appeals; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. CHANDLER:

H. R. 2208. A bill to amend Public Law No. 190 of the Sixty-sixth Congress; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. ROMJUE:

H. R. 2209. A bill fixing annual salaries for postmasters at fourth-class post offices and readjusting salaries at certain third-class post offices; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. TAYLOR of Colorado:

H. J. Res. 83. Joint resolution making an additional appropriation for work relief and relief for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1939; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. HOBBS:

H. J. Res. 84. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States granting the Congress the power to regulate the production of any and all farm products and to buy and sell all such products as are capable of being stored for an indefinite period of time without material deterioration; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

H. J. Res. 85. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year General Pulaski's Memorial Day, for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SECREST:

H. J. Res. 86. Joint resolution creating a commission for the erection of a memorial building to the memory of the veterans of the Civil War, to be known as the Ladies of the Grand Army of the Republic National Shrine Commission; to the Committee on the Library.

By Mr. CONNERY:

H. J. Res. 87. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year General Pulaski's Memorial Day, for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MAPES:

H. J. Res. 88. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim October 11 of each year General Pulaski's Memorial Day, for the observance and commemoration of the death of Brig. Gen. Casimir Pulaski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LUDLOW:

H. J. Res. 89. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States to provide for a referendum on war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McCORMACK:

H. J. Res. 90. Joint resolution relating to the petition for naturalization and the oaths of allegiance of citizens of the State of Eire who desire to become citizens of the United States; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. VREELAND:

H. J. Res. 91. Joint resolution requesting the President to proclaim February 11 as Edison Day, in commemoration of the birthday of Thomas Alva Edison; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOLLES:

H. Res. 47. A resolution to investigate the effect of reciprocal-trade agreements on agriculture; to the Committee on Rules.

## PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN:

H. R. 2210. A bill for the relief of Rev. and Mrs. E. F. Wachholz; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2211. A bill for the relief of Mr. and Mrs. S. P. Crandall, Jr.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CARLSON:

H. R. 2212. A bill granting an increase of pension to Milton Lee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2213. A bill granting an increase of pension to George Taylor Lee; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. CASEY of Massachusetts:

H. R. 2214. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of M. Grace Murphy, administratrix of the estate of John H. Murphy, deceased, against the United States; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2215. A bill to extend the emergency officers' retirement benefits to William L. Roach, formerly second lieutenant, Three Hundred and Fourteenth Regiment United States Infantry; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 2216. A bill granting a pension to Katherine R. Salmon; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2217. A bill for the relief of Samuel J. Swain; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 2218. A bill for the relief of Mary E. Spinney; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 2219. A bill for the relief of Ame La Fernais; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 2220. A bill for the relief of Henry Werre; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 2221. A bill for the relief of Marion L. Gates; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2222. A bill for the relief of Eleanor J. Griggs, Dorothy L. Griggs, and Vernon M. Griggs; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. CONNERY:

H. R. 2223. A bill to recognize the high public service rendered by soldiers who volunteered and served in trench-fever experiments in the American Expeditionary Forces; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CARLSON:

H. R. 2224. A bill granting an increase of pension to Clara Fowler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2225. A bill granting an increase of pension to Nancy L. Willson; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DELANEY:

H. R. 2226. A bill for the relief of Adele Muller; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. DIMOND:

H. R. 2227. A bill granting a pension to Frances H. Cochran; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DUNCAN:

H. R. 2228. A bill granting an increase of pension to Martha Graves; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2229. A bill granting an increase of pension to Clara B. Teegarden; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2230. A bill granting an increase of pension to Lida A. Beverly; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2231. A bill granting a pension to Mary C. McKarin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DOUGLAS:

H. R. 2232. A bill granting a pension to Nellie M. Benjamin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EBERHARTER:

H. R. 2233. A bill for the relief of Rocco Lucadamo; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

H. R. 2234. A bill for the relief of W. E. R. Covell; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. FERGUSON:

H. R. 2235. A bill granting a pension to Joseph K. Sullivan; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 2236. A bill granting a pension to Walter Connolly; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 2237. A bill for the relief of Frank Fanning; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 2238. A bill for the relief of Harry A. Kuhlman; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

H. R. 2239. A bill granting an increase of pension to Hannah Casler; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2240. A bill granting a pension to James Vergil Wright; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 2241. A bill granting a pension to Conrad F. Korthanke; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 2242. A bill granting a pension to Harley D. Peck; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 2243. A bill granting a pension to C. R. McGill; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 2244. A bill granting a pension to James D. Hembree; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. GRAHAM:

H. R. 2245. A bill granting an increase of pension to Clara Hammond; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOPE:

H. R. 2246. A bill granting a pension to Charles G. Hostutler; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. KRAMER:

H. R. 2247. A bill granting a pension to Freda Boy; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 2248. A bill awarding Distinguished Service Crosses to Tony Siminoff, Oliver F. Rominger, and Robert E. Beck, veterans of the Philippine Insurrection; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. McANDREWS:

H. R. 2249. A bill granting a pension to Ethel M. Lord; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 2250. A bill for the relief of Frank Malles, Jr.; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McARDLE:

H. R. 2251. A bill for the relief of Russell Anderegg, a minor, and George W. Anderegg; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. THOMAS S. McMILLAN:

H. R. 2252. A bill granting an increase of pension to Maribel Williams Croft; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 2253. A bill granting an increase of pension to Jeanette W. Moffett; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. McREYNOLDS:

H. R. 2254. A bill granting a pension to Mae Belle Blackwell Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MILLS of Arkansas:

H. R. 2255. A bill for the relief of J. N. Sutherland, Lula E. Lucas, W. E. Cooper, J. D. Wallace, and J. F. Martin; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. MACIEJEWSKI:

H. R. 2256. A bill granting a pension to Sophie M. Peterson; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. MAY:

H. R. 2257 (by request). A bill to authorize certain officers and enlisted men of the United States Army to accept such medals, orders, and decorations as have been tendered them by foreign governments in appreciation of services rendered; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. PACE:

H. R. 2258. A bill for the relief of Elbert R. Miller; to the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation.

By Mr. PFEIFER:

H. R. 2259. A bill for the relief of Stanley Mercuri; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2260. A bill for the relief of Nicola and Nunziata D'Aprile; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

By Mr. RANDOLPH:

H. R. 2261. A bill to authorize and direct the Commissioners of the District of Columbia to set aside the trial board conviction of Policemen David R. Thompson and Ralph S. Warner and their resultant dismissal, and to reinstate David



R. Thompson and Ralph S. Warner to their former positions as members of the Metropolitan Police Department; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. RAYBURN:

H. R. 2262. A bill for the relief of Pauline Jenkins and Mabel Daugherty; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2263. A bill for the relief of Loyd Bates; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. ROMJUE:

H. R. 2264. A bill for the relief of Evelyn Gurley-Kane; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2265. A bill granting a pension to Louise Kerner; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SNYDER:

H. R. 2266. A bill granting an increase of pension to Mary E. Wetmiller; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2267. A bill granting an increase of pension to Georgiana K. Griest; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2268. A bill granting a pension to John William Marshall; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2269. A bill granting an increase of pension to Mame D. Reed; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SUTPHIN:

H. R. 2270. A bill for the relief of S. H. Brown and M. Brown, also known as the Universal Steamship Co., a Georgia corporation, to cover the loss of their bark *Brown Brothers* destroyed by a German raider during the World War; to the Committee on War Claims.

H. R. 2271. A bill granting a pension to Kenneth A. Cranmer; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 2272. A bill for the relief of M. Brown and S. H. Brown; to the Committee on War Claims.

H. R. 2273. A bill providing a pension for Lizzie May Wilbur Clayton; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VAN ZANDT:

H. R. 2274. A bill granting a pension to Lydia Frances Nyman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. VINCENT of Kentucky:

H. R. 2275. A bill granting a pension to Luther Skaggs; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 2276. A bill granting a pension to Laura C. Clarke; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2277. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims of the United States to hear and determine the claims of Rock Spring Distilling Co., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2278. A bill for the relief of Carl Hurt; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2279. A bill granting an increase of pension to Dena Phillips; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WOLCOTT:

H. R. 2280. A bill granting a pension to Ida Carter; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2281. A bill granting a pension to Gussie Gates; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 2282. A bill granting a pension to Margaret Fonda; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

H. R. 2283. A bill for the relief of the estate of Elizabeth Purtill O'Brien; to the Committee on Claims.

H. R. 2284. A bill granting a pension to Richard J. Huss; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 2285. A bill granting a pension to Maud Patterson; to the Committee on Pensions.

H. R. 2286. A bill for the relief of Wasyl Kulmatycki; to the Committee on Claims.

#### PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

77. By Mr. CASE of South Dakota: Resolution unanimously adopted by the Retail Merchants Association of South Dakota at a meeting on December 15, 1938, urging a change in the present method of surplus commodity distribution, and recommending some plan similar to the 1934 program of

relief distribution be adopted; to the Committee on Appropriations.

78. By Mr. CONNERY: Petition of citizens of Massachusetts, protesting against the supplying of war and other materials to Japan by American manufacturers; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

79. By Mr. KEOGH: Petition of the Loyal Order of Moose, Borough Hall Lodge, No. 222, Brooklyn, N. Y., concerning Dies investigating committee; to the Committee on Rules.

80. By Mr. KINZER: Petition of the citizens of Drumore, Lancaster County, Pa., to promote the general welfare of the people of the United States by abolishing the great advertising campaign for the sale of alcoholic beverages now going on by press and radio; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

81. By Mr. KEOGH: Petition of the Walnut Hall Realty Corporation, New York City, concerning the Patman chain-store bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

82. By Mr. PFEIFER: Petition of the Loyal Order of Moose, Borough Hall Lodge, No. 222, Brooklyn, N. Y., urging continuance of the Dies committee; to the Committee on Rules.

83. Also, telegram from the American Federation of Musicians, Local 802, New York City, urging support for adequate appropriations for the arts and Federal theater projects in New York City; to the Committee on Appropriations.

84. By Mr. RICH: Petition of citizens of Williamsport and Lycoming County, Pa., favoring the policy of neutrality as enunciated in the act of August 31, 1935, and also the act of May 1, 1937, etc.; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

85. Also, petition of citizens of Williamsport, Pa., and other towns in Lycoming and Clinton Counties, Pa., favoring the so-called retain chain store tax bill; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

86. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of the Catholic Daughters of America, Court Carroll, No. 299, Wheeling, W. Va., urging the continuation of the Dies committee, unhampered and well financed; to the Committee on Rules.

87. Also, petition of the Purity Council, No. 62, Daughters of America, Weirton, W. Va., opposing any action that will suspend the present immigration laws thus permitting the free influx of political refugees without compliance with the laws requiring ability to maintain themselves and also setting aside the quota provisions of the present laws; and urging the cancelation of the naturalization papers of those naturalized citizens who are members of groups spreading un-American activities; and opposing the adoption of any measures proposing to change the present established quotas and regulations now in effect in connection with the admission of aliens; to the Committee on Immigration and Naturalization.

88. By the SPEAKER: Petition of the Military Order of the Loyal Legion of the United States, Philadelphia, Pa., petitioning consideration of their resolution with reference to fingerprinting of all persons in the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

## HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, JANUARY 11, 1939

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

*O give thanks unto the Lord; for He is good; for His mercy endureth forever.*

Heavenly Father, at the altar of prayer we give Thee praise and our humble devotion. Thou who art so abundant in wisdom, help us to live by our higher natures. Inspire this day by Thy holy presence that our labors may conform to the precepts of the Teacher of Nazareth. Thou who dost breathe upon the cloud, lifts the mist and reveals the shore line to the courageous mariners, give clearness of vision and show the truth to all who seek it. May the power of the Most High God move among all the peoples of the earth and let His glory fill the whole world. We beseech Thee to remember the sick. However cold the day, weak the